1	For Official Committee of Tort Claimants:	
2	Tort Claimants:	LAUREN T. ATTARD, ESQ. (Telephonically)
3		JORAN ROSE, ESQ. (Telephonically)
4		ERIC E. SAGERMAN, ESQ. (Telephonically)
5		Baker & Hostetler LLP 1160 Battery Street East Suite 100
6		San Francisco, CA 94111 (628)208-6436
7	For Official Committee of	
8	Creditors:	GREGORY BRAY, ESQ. Milbank LLP 2029 Century Park East
9		33rd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067
10		(424) 386-4470
11	For Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders:	DAVID H. BOTTER, ESQ. Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
12	Notellolacis.	One Bryant Park New York, NY 10036
13		(212) 872–1000
14	For United States Trustee:	TIMOHTY S. LAFFREDI, ESQ. Office of the U.S. Trustee
15		SF 450 Golden Gate Avenue Suite 05-0153
16		San Francisco, CA 94102 (415)705-3333
17		
18	For SLF Fire Victim Claimants:	JAMES P. HILL, ESQ. CHRISTOPHER V. HAWKINS, ESQ. Sullivan Hill Box & Engel
19		Sullivan Hill Rez & Engel 600 B. Street Suite 1700
20		San Diego, CA 92101 (619)233-4100
21		(013) 233 4100
22	For City and County of San Francisco:	EDWARD TREDINNICK, ESQ. (Telephonically)
23		Green, Radovsky, Maloney and Share 4 Embarcadero Center #4000
24		San Francisco, CA 94111 (415)981-1400
25		(-10, 301 1100

		-
1	For Ghost Ship Warehouse:	ESTELA O. PINO, ESQ.
2		(Telephonically) Pino & Associates 20 Bicentennial Circle
3		Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95826
4		(916) 641-2288
5	For Engineers and Scientists of California, Local 20, IFPTE:	CAITLIN GRAY, ESQ. EMILY RICH, ESQ.
6		(Telephonically) Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld 1001 Marian Village Parkway Suite 200 Alameda, CA 94501
7		
9	For International Brotherhood Electrical Workers Local Union:	W. STEVEN BRYANT, ESQ. (Telephonically) Locke Lord LLP
	Workers Local Official.	600 Congress Avenue
11		Suite 2200 Austin, TX 78701
12		(512) 305-4700
13	For Itron, Inc. & Curtiss-Wright:	MICHAEL BUSENKELL, ESQ. (Telephonically)
14		Gellert Scali Busenkell & Brown,
15		1201 North Orange Street Suite 300
16		Wilmington, DE 19801
17		(302) 425-5812
18	For CPUC:	BRIAN S. HERMANN, ESQ. (Telephonically)
19		ALAN KORNBERG, ESQ. (Telephonically)
20		SEAN MITCHELL, ESQ. (Telephonically)
21		Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
22		1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019
23		(212) 373-3000
24		
25		

1	For California Department of Toxic Control:	PAUL J. PASCUZZI, ESQ. (Telephonically)
2	of foxic control.	Felderstein Fitzgerald Willoughby & Pascuzzi LLP
3		400 Capital Mall Suite 1750
4		Sacramento, CA 95814 (916)329-7400
5	For Southern Power	HARRIS B. WINSBERG, ESQ.
6	Company:	(Telephonically) Troutman Sanders LLP
7		600 Peachtree Street NE Suite 3000
8		Atlanta, GA 30308 (404)885-3348
9		
10	For Atlas:	THOMAS TOSDAL, ESQ. (Telephonically) Tosdal Law Firm
11		777 South Highway 101 Suite 215
12		Solana Beach, CA 92075 (858)704-4709
13		
14	For Jenna, et al:	NICHOLAS JP. WAGNER, ESQ. (Telephonically) Wagner, Jones, Kopfman & Artenian
15		LLP 1111 East Herndon Avenue
16		Suite 317 Fresno, CA 93720
17		(559) 449–1800
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		6
1		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	Ţ	JANE GALVANI Jnited States Bankruptcy
19		Court 450 Golden Gate Avenue
20		16th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102
21		MICHAEL DRAKE eScribers, LLC
22	-	7227 N. 16th Street Suite #207
23	I	Phoenix, AZ 85020 (973)406-2250
24		
25	Proceedings recorded by elect transcript provided by transcript	
200: 10	20099 Doc# 1225 Filed: 04/10/10	e Cribers 1/10/10 16:42:E1 Dago 6 of

1	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2019, 9:31 AM		
2	-000-		
3	(Call to order of the Court.)		
4	THE CLERK: In the matter of PG&E Corporation.		
5	THE COURT: Go ahead and just call the case out.		
6	THE CLERK: PG&E Corporation.		
7	THE COURT: Good afternoon. Good morning, everyone.		
8	One housekeeping chore. Ms. Kim, are you here? No,		
9	don't get up. I want to thank you, again, for the		
10	comprehensive binders you've been preparing for us. I tell		
11	you, you really don't have to do them anymore. They're very		
12	voluminous and they're very helpful. But with the way that		
13	everyone has been responding to chambers copies and sometimes		
14	we have to make them ourselves, frequently we're already up to		
15	speed on most everything you have.		
16	And I think since you're putting the agenda on the		
17	docket, that's helpful. And we can take it from there. So		
18	thank you for doing it, but you don't need to do it anymore. I		
19	appreciate it.		
20	MS. KIM: Thank you, Your Honor.		
21	THE COURT: Okay. Going to the regular schedule		
22	oh. Mr. Karotkin, shall we go with the ready for the		
23	professional application?		
24	MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir.		
25	THE COURT: Yeah. Well, as I said, I just had a		

1 couple of very quick matters. I mean, I assume that you or no
2 one else has anything to supplement with them, right?

MR. KAROTKIN: Not that I'm aware of, sir.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

THE COURT: Okay. Very minor points. I mean, they're very insignificant. Well, I did ask you what is the debtor's response to the official creditors' committee's desire to be treated equally like the tort claimants' committee's members?

No problem?

MR. KAROTKIN: No, sir, none at all.

THE COURT: Yeah. I think -- again, I don't like to make a big deal of a simple procedure, but counsel for the creditors' committee should next time get a consent or shorten time or do something so we won't get a -- into problem. But I will go ahead and authorize the members of the two committees to be reimbursed their expenses consistent with the procedures that are laid out in the tort claimants' committee's papers. So that takes care of that one.

One the other professional application -- or excuse me, professional retention ones, they're very minor. The first comment is one that's addressed probably to only the Weil firm, the Keller Benvenutti and -- one second -- I think that's all. In those cases -- in most cases, you've made the proper recitals about your firms not being -- excuse me, your firms being disinterested.

And I just want to state what is obvious. I'm not

making a determination; I'm taking your representations. And if circumstances either develop in the future or come to either firms' attention that changes that, I expect you'll have to take appropriate action. I don't want to -- I hope we don't ever have to cross that bridge. But that's just what the law would require.

And then secondly, again, consistent with the -- I think the case law on this subject, if there are conflicts -- not the question of whether you're disinterested or not, but the question of whether there some conflicts that surface or that were previously not identified, again, you all know the rules. The burdens are on -- we're paying professionals to take action and do what has to be done. So I don't want to -- it's not an adverse issue at the moment. It's just a reminder.

And for the Keller Benvenutti application only, I believe, if I read it correctly, the application there recites that the firm wishes to have the option under circumstances if it's necessary to withdraw from the representation. I don't anticipate that will happen. But I need to make sure that the order -- the retention order clarifies that that is subject to court approval. That's been my procedure for all retained counsel for Chapter 11 debtors-in-possession.

So I want to make sure the order for approving the retention of Keller & Benvenutti is consistent with that since the recitals in there about it -- there's a -- if there's a

desire to terminate the representation that it's done on a court order unless -- yeah. And let's leave it at that for now.

So again, I don't need a response from anyone. I'll just act on it and make sure that the orders are consistent with that when they're uploaded.

The next one I have is really a question. And it's only a question. And that is why is Prime Clerk being employed under Section 327. I mean, I've always thought that professionals -- and I'm not suggesting that they're not professional. But with a capital P, professionals who were employed under Section 327, there's a lot of baggage. There's more -- or in a difficult reporting, there's filed applications. I want to -- is this a major issue for the debtor or does anybody care? I mean, if Prime Clerk wants to burden itself that way, I guess I'll say fine, do it.

MR. KAROTKIN: I understand that's the way Prime Clerk typically does it. And we certainly have no issues with that.

THE COURT: Well, as I say, if they want to over -make it more difficult, okay. I'll accept that. That's what
they did. I mean, they know what they're doing. And I have
been skeptical about indemnification procedures for retained
professionals. But I think under these circumstances, it's a
different function. It's not some of the other kind of
professionals that have that issues. And so I'm okay with

1 | that, having reviewed the language.

2 And the Prime Clerk's retention will be approved.

As far as the application for the chief restructuring officer to not have a problem -- wait one second -- from -- yeah, no problem. So there is no questions on that.

So the final one has to do with counsel for the tort claimants' committee, Baker & Hostetler. Who's here today for that?

MR. ROSE: Good morning, Your Honor. Jorian Rose from Baker 7 Hostetler.

THE COURT: Just a simple question. This is -- I mean, we're here to do other things today. This is the one application that did not make reference to the Court's compensation guidelines because we have, of course, United States Trustee guidelines for compensation. But we have also have, as the local practitioners know in the Northern District, compensation guidelines for the professionals.

Hostetler on behalf of the committee, even though the lawyers -- the firm is not being employed under Section 327 but rather under Section 1103, that's not the point here. The point is that when it comes time for compensation allowances and so on, I want to make sure that the applicants are aware of the slight difference between our compensation guidelines and the U.S. Trustee guidelines. And the retention order should

1 reflect both of those sets of guidelines.

2 So with that --

3 MR. ROSE: Your Honor --

4 THE COURT: Yes, sir? Okay.

5 MR. ROSE: -- we're happy to make that adjustment.

6 THE COURT: Yeah. Just pick it up in the order. No,

7 I knew you would. Because if you didn't -- if you weren't

happy to, then you wouldn't get retained. So I just --

MR. ROSE: Agreed. Agreed.

10 THE COURT: All right.

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So unless there's someone else in court or on the phone that wants to be heard, the way I follow it on our agenda, the only item that we're dealing with this morning and that you're all here for is the so-called STIP motion. And as I said to the parties by way of a brief docket text, I just had a couple of preliminary questions.

So, Mr. Karotkin, I'll just address this to you unless you want to pass it off on somebody else. And that is does the debtor have a position on -- specific and separate from the arguments made either by the U.S. Trustee or the tort claim committee on Local 20 and the position taken by Local 20 that some number of their members are entitled to be compensated under the procedure as a matter of the collective bargaining agreement. I saw their response. And I didn't hear anything

from the debtor. And I just needed to know what your position is.

MR. KAROTKIN: We've had further discussions with Local 20. And I think that -- I don't want to speak for them. They're here today. I think it's fair to say that they support the motion.

THE COURT: No, I know that.

MR. KAROTKIN: And with respect to 2018, that would remain open going forward as a dispute, whether they would be entitled to it under the terms of the contract or whether it -- the debtor's effort to terminate that violated 1113 or those provisions.

But insofar as going forward, they have no objection subject to the reservation of rights of 2018.

THE COURT: Well, but what I'm -- you're saying something different. Maybe I didn't ask the question correctly. There are several, as you know, objections to the STIP motion. And again, we'll hear at length about -- the arguments for and against their position.

But it seemed like 1,600 or so members of Local 20 would fall into a different category perhaps. And I'll let the other parties when they're making their arguments say whether that should be treated differently. I mean, I suppose if I overrule the objections and grant the motion with whatever modifications you're going to report, that's one thing. If I

defer it or deny it, then I need to get some indication on how to deal with that one subset of people to see whether they're treated differently. Again, we don't have to do more about it now.

So the second question for you though is, when the case got filed, there was a motion to go forward with the STIP -- a STIP, 2018 version. It involved 4,000 more employees and substantially less money.

Now, my question for you, just as a preliminary, is what happens to those 4,000 employees and what happens to the other 14,000 employees who aren't covered by the STIP? Are we going to be getting more motions for them? I need -- or is that something that's not on the horizon? This is really just to know what's coming down the road and whether there's a relationship. Are you able to answer that, Mr. Karotkin?

MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KAROTKIN: Give me one moment.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

MR. KAROTKIN: First of all, as to your question as to whether it is substantially more money, when you take into account, Your Honor, the proposed STIP payments for 2019 which includes the LTIP --

24 THE COURT: Right.

MR. KAROTKIN: -- for approximately 400 employees at

fifty percent of the normal LTIP rate, the numbers are
comparable. They're about -- each about, at target, 235
million dollars based on target for 2018, including the LTIP

5 THE COURT: Well, that --

payment that --

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

6 MR. KAROTKIN: -- would have been made.

THE COURT: I'll get to some questions later after the arguments about trying to understand the mechanics of all of this. But the one big question that comes out is the LTIP participants, at least some of them, were getting some equity component. And now they're not. Now, again, if you're not getting equity and you're getting money and you're getting more money, then the question is, well, is that a good thing or a bad thing.

For today, for the preliminary question, I just really want -- I want to make sure I'm clear then what happens -- what is the fate, if there was a fate, to the people who are employed by the debtors that aren't within the 10,000 or so people that are the beneficiaries of the 2019 STIP if indeed it's approved.

MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. Again, my numbers reflect that, going to back to -- you said 4,000 people, additional people that for 2018, there were approximately 10,800 people in the STIP.

THE COURT: Okay. Maybe I misread it then.

- 1 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.
- 2 THE COURT: All right. I --
- 3 MR. KAROTKIN: And for this year, there's
- 4 approximately 10,000.
- 5 THE COURT: No. Then if I misspoke --
- 6 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.
- 7 THE COURT: -- and I misunderstood it, then I am
- 8 corrected. Then --
- 9 MR. KAROTKIN: And as we indicated, the STIP does not
- 10 cover the top twelve insiders.
- 11 THE COURT: No, I understand. I understand.
- MR. KAROTKIN: And there is no plan for a STIP for the
- remaining 14,000 or so employees.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KAROTKIN: The only potential things that the
- debtors are contemplating would be a key employee retention
- 17 | plan for the top twelve which would be brought to the Court.
- And perhaps, perhaps a KERP that would only encompass 400
- 19 employees.
- THE COURT: Okay. Again, I don't want to bog you down
- 21 or sidetrack it with questions. You've answered the question
- 22 adequately for now. And if next week or next month or next
- year there is a change in position, I'm not going to say you
- 24 | committed to something else. I'm just -- you're just giving me
- 25 a report.

1 My final question is really something maybe I should 2 know the answer to. But the Mr. Mistry's paper, his 3 declaration, and maybe the other one too but certainly his, 4 identify -- or they make reference to a compensation committee 5 made up of four independent board members. Am I correct there 6 is no independent board of the utility? Is that true or is 7 there a board of directors of utility as distinguished from the 8 parent company?

MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. There are two boards.

THE COURT: Okay.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KAROTKIN: They're essentially the same people.

THE COURT: Well, okay. But wearing their utility board hat, are they the ones that approved this STIP or --

MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. As I understand it, yes, sir, in their capacity of members of the compensation committee evaluating the utilities that -- yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Those are my only preliminary questions. So I departed from the usual procedure of treating the debtor as the moving party. The debtor is the moving party. And normally the moving party is called to present its case first. But I am fully informed of this. And I've read the papers more than once. And it's thoroughly briefed. And I really want to zero in on the challenges to it by the opponents.

And by listing who I want to hear from, I wasn't

excluding or intending to exclude any other party who has

stated an opposition. I just was identifying for sequencing

who I'd hear from first. And then, obviously, I will give the

debtor's representatives ample opportunity respond. And I

somehow think I probably will have questions somewhere along

the line again. So unless you have an objection, that's the

way I want to proceed.

MR. KAROTKIN: No, no objection to the way --

9 THE COURT: Okay.

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

24

25

MR. KAROTKIN: -- you want to proceed. Perhaps just a housekeeping matter.

12 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KAROTKIN: In terms of the procedures, last week we spoke with Mr. Julian from the tort committee, Mr. Laffredi, and Mr. Hawkins about whether they intended to take any cross-examination of our declarants. And they said that they did not intend to do so. Obviously, our declarants are here in court today if anyone has any questions.

19 THE COURT: Well, I wasn't anticipating that.

MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.

21 THE COURT: I mean, even if they had said they wanted 22 to, I wasn't going to turn this into a trial.

MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.

THE COURT: I mean, I may -- they may persuade me that they should have a further opportunity. They did have an

- 1 opportunity during the --
- 2 MR. KAROTKIN: They did.
- 3 THE COURT: -- the depositions, right?
- MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir. But we would ask that the three declarations be admitted into evidence for purposes of the hearing.
 - THE COURT: Well, I'll tell you what. I'll take that as a request. And then I'll -- and when opposing counsel are making their argument, they can tell me if they have any objection.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.

7

8

9

10

- THE COURT: I mean, to some extent, and I don't mean
 to be critical of the two declarants, but there's a lot of
 duplication. I mean, the charge, the list, and the metrics and
 the details are the same thing twice. And so I don't know that
 there's any harm in taking it into evidence. I still have to
 make the judgment call and exercise of the business judgment.

 So --
- MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir.
- 20 THE COURT: All right. So my invitation to have 21 people speak, let's first start with the U.S. Trustee.
- So, Mr. Laffredi, do you wish to be heard? And
 because I didn't -- and I asked this in part because I thought
 you had some very interesting questions. And I didn't see any
 response to your questions. And so I want you to respond to

1 | the lack of response to your questions and --

2 MR. LAFFREDI: Right. Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: -- take it from there.

4 MR. LAFFREDI: And Tim Laffredi for the U.S. Trustee.

Essentially, the U.S. Trustee's objection is that the debtors fail to meet their burden under either 503(c)(1) or

7 = 503(c)(3). With regard to 503(c)(1) --

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, the two declarants did say that they aren't any insiders. I mean, that is some prima facie proof that they said that. And they must have a basis for it.

MR. LAFFREDI: Right. Well, that's the problem, is it's of a very conclusory statement that, no, they're not insiders; yes, this is incentivizing. How do we know that? What are the metrics?

THE COURT: Well, I was breaking it into parts. I mean, insider -- if you're an insider, A. If you're not an insider, you go to question B, right?

MR. LAFFREDI: Right, exactly.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

MR. LAFFREDI: So with regard to the insider question, we don't know exactly -- I mean, there are some insiders who technically would fall under the definition of an insider under the Bankruptcy Code. And the debtors indicate, well, that doesn't mean that they're actually insiders. How do we know that? We don't know who they are. We don't know who they

- report to. We don't know their names. We don't know their responsibilities. We don't even know what exactly they do with
- 3 the company.
- 4 THE COURT: Did you have an opportunity to ask Mr.
- 5 Mistry those questions from the deposition or did you choose
- 6 not to?
- 7 MR. LAFFREDI: No.
- 8 THE COURT: I mean, did you -- was that -- I mean, I
- 9 realize you wouldn't want to take the time at a deposition to
- get the names of 10,000 people. But some basic questions
- 11 perhaps could have been asked. And that's something you chose
- 12 not to do.
- MR. LAFFREDI: Well, we did not participate in that.
- 14 THE COURT: Oh, okay. I didn't realize that. I
- didn't know if you were -- you weren't excluded from it?
- MR. LAFFREDI: No, I don't believe so.
- 17 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. LAFFREDI: But we did not --
- 19 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. LAFFREDI: But regardless, the debtors bear that
- 21 burden to demonstrate that these are not insiders. Just saying
- 22 they're not insiders to us does not satisfy that burden.
- 23 THE COURT: But that -- I mean, it's easy to identify
- 24 | the easy ones. But the person in control is so subjective.
- 25 How would you ever do it efficiently without going through

1 | 10,000 people?

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 2 MR. LAFFREDI: Well --
- 3 THE COURT: I mean, I suppose 8,000 of them or 9,000 4 is pretty easy. They aren't. But there may be some people 5 that are on the cusp there.

6 MR. LAFFREDI: Well, and that's part of what we would 7 prefer to see, is who are these 10,000 people and what do they 8 do, so you could go through and say, all right, well, this 9 person clearly does not have any control or they do not make 10 decisions that would affect generally the operations of the 11 debtor, but this person does. Oh, this person is the vice 12 president. What exactly does that mean? What do they do? 13 do they report to?

And some of the information that's contained in the declaration, I mean, doesn't even really address that. So that was our concern. And in the reply, it didn't really clear that up for us. So those are the questions that are remaining with regard to the insiders. With regard to the --

- THE COURT: May I assume that --
- MR. LAFFREDI: Yes.
- 21 THE COURT: -- the U.S. Trustee -- if I really insist
 22 that the actual detail get provided, that could be done on a
 23 confidential basis to the U.S. Trustee or perhaps the other
 24 committees if they want.
- MR. LAFFREDI: I believe so, Your Honor. But the

issue is that it should be disclosed to the public. If the debtors wanted to protect that information from other disclosure, they would have to seek relief under 107 which they have not done. And those are very strict requirements. And I'm not sure they'd be able to meet those standards.

And same with the incentivizing nature of the plan.

It's not exactly clear. Are these metrics very easy to attain or are they very difficult? Are they layups, as the Dayna 2 (phonetic) indicated, or are they something that they would actually have to strive for? And so that's part of the issue here too is that we don't know -- and it's the debtor's burden to demonstrate that this truly is an incentivizing plan and not a retentive plan. And then finally, even if --

THE COURT: Well, what if it's just a decision by management to recognize that this is a tough time for the company dealing with all the problems that it's -- some of which it's blamed for, some of which perhaps it's not blamed for but it's got to cope with them and it's bankruptcy and, therefore, management says that it's going to give people a slight pay raise? That's certainly within their discretion, right?

MR. LAFFREDI: Right. But does that mean that it is an incentivizing plan? Does that meet the standards of the statute? And if they are going to give everybody a pay raise, I would think, no, it doesn't. But that's part of the issue,

1 is that they need to present this evidence. They need to put 2 this forward. They need to prove to the Court and to creditors 3 and parties-in-interest who might want to take a look at that 4 what are the metrics, looking at past metrics, whatever they've 5 been doing in the past, what were the incentives in the past, what were the guidelines that they had to meet in the past, are 6 7 they just doing the exact same thing, are they making it 8 easier, what is it. That's the problem. We don't know what it 9 is.

And the general statements of, well, it's going to be fifty percent of this and so many miles of vegetation clearing, that's great. But is that something that is easily attainable?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then finally, even if this plan would fall under the more permissive 503(c)(3), the debtors still have not demonstrated that this plan would be justified under the facts and circumstances.

THE COURT: Again, that's the real subjective thing, isn't it?

MR. LAFFREDI: Right, exactly. Yes.

And so -- but even with that, we don't know what the targets are. We don't know what the historical information is. We don't have any frame of reference to determine, oh, we're just going to throw this out there and give everybody a raise just because we want to.

THE COURT: Well, when you say you don't know the

target, is that because when you looked at the metrics and the definitions of the three levels, that you can't put any flesh on the bone? I mean, it's a structure. But I have --

4 MR. LAFFREDI: The general structure is there, true, 5 yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LAFFREDI: The problem is what exactly is a metric, how many miles of vegetation do you have to clear in order to reach this goal.

THE COURT: But this isn't a particular individual's goal. This isn't like saying to a worker you've got to do fifty of X's when you used to do them forty. This is companywide.

MR. LAFFREDI: Well, and even so, Your Honor, we'd have to see what was it last year. Is this goal like a layup, as the Court noted? Is it so easy that they don't even really need to try, they're just going to get it anyway? And that's the problem. Why would that be appropriate under the facts and circumstances of this bankruptcy case?

So basically, Your Honor, that's our argument. We've already put everything in our objection. The reply did not address those issues and those concerns. And so we do not think that the debtor has met its burden in demonstrating that the plan as --

25 THE COURT: So what --

1 MR. LAFFREDI: -- proposed is appropriate.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

THE COURT: -- do you think I should do? Because I'm going to ask the same question of the others. I'm supposed to use my discretion to decide whether the management has used its business judgment within the limits or the parameters of what's expected of the company. Do I just deny it? Is that what you think I should do?

MR. LAFFREDI: Well, I think the Court should deny it until -- unless and until it provides the information that would allow anybody sitting in this room or out there to make a call, okay, well, this actually makes sense. Whatever they did in the past, this actually might be a difficult goal to reach. Is it actually would be incentivizing, is it retentive, do they just get the money for sitting around and staying with the company?

If the debtor was able to provide the information that, for example, the U.S. Trustee indicated was not available and prevents this from being approved, then yeah, we might be able to make a determination, okay, so these are not insiders, these people who have these positions and have these responsibilities, they wouldn't qualify under the Bankruptcy Code's definition. So until -- unless and until the debtors provide that information, I don't believe the Court can grant this motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Laffredi.

- 1 MR. LAFFREDI: Thank you, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Tort claim committee, who's speaking
- 3 today? You, Mr. Julian?
- 4 MR. JULIAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Julian,
- 5 Baker & Hostetler, appearing on behalf of the official
- 6 committee of tort claimants.
- 7 THE COURT: Yeah. Try to focus your argument. I
- 8 don't want to hear bad faith --
- 9 MR. JULIAN: I got you.
- 10 THE COURT: -- and conflicts. I mean, those are
- 11 | really buzzwords that didn't seem to have to be in your
- 12 argument. So --
- MR. JULIAN: What I'd like to do is, before starting
- 14 my argument, is supplement the committee's record by handing up
- 15 to the Court a document that we hadn't seen until the union
- 16 | filed it and two demonstrative charts --
- 17 THE COURT: Well, the other side, they --
- MR. JULIAN: -- Your Honor, I have a copy for you
- 19 and --
- THE COURT: They've all seen them? The debtor has
- 21 | seen them?
- MR. JULIAN: Yes.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: I handed them to them before the hearing.
- Your Honor, may I approach the Court?

- THE COURT: Sure. Sure. You said --
- 2 MR. JULIAN: Your Honor, I have two copies.
- 3 THE COURT: You said something that was filed by the
- 4 Local. That's subsequent or -- subsequent to the -- I mean,
- 5 the Local filed its opposition. But is there something else
- 6 that came from Local 20?
- 7 MR. JULIAN: No. This is attached to the Joshua
- 8 Sperry's declaration --
- 9 THE COURT: Okay.
- 10 MR. JULIAN: -- as Exhibit D. And I wanted to start
- with it because we spent a great deal of time on PG&E's HR VP,
- Mistry, discussing why the 2018 STIP was withdrawn. And the
- actual email from the CEO explains that it has to do with the
- 14 2019 STIP.
- 15 THE COURT: That's the message from Mr. Simon.
- MR. JULIAN: Yes. And so I'd like to go over -- and,
- 17 Your Honor, I'm not going to read from the exhibits today
- 18 except for this one. It's rather illuminating, I believe.
- 19 This is interim CEO John Simon's February 22, 2019 email to the
- 20 employees announcing the withdraw of the 2018 STIP and some
- 21 changes in the STIP for the 2019 period.
- And on the first page, at the bottom of the email, CEO
- 23 Simon addresses the reason why he and the board withdraw the
- 24 STIP. And he says, "Ultimately, we decided together that the
- 25 | 2018 STIP should not be paid because to do so would, in effect,

put ourselves at the front of the line for that payment ahead of thousands of others pre-petition claimants and creditors who we currently cannot pay and who must await resolution of the Chapter 11 process."

On the second page, he states, "As a starting point, our STIP is at-risk compensation. That's how it has been designed. There are no guarantees. Our performance score, based on the metrics for 2018, was a little better than 1.5. That's good on paper. But our STIP metric results do not align with where we find ourselves. In 2018, there was a significant human toll from the campfire. There were eighty-six fatalities. Some 14,000 structures were destroyed. And the time of Paradise is largely gone. Families have been disrupted, some forever. We're facing thousands of claims from campfire victims.

"While the cause of the campfire is still under investigation, we have filed reports with the CPUC that indicate our equipment have been involved. This has created wide-scale uncertainty of our business, leading to credit downgrades and, in part, to our Chapter 11 filing."

And down below on that email, he states, "Looking at the whole picture, can we say we met the spirit of our plans for the year? Considering the impacts of the wildfires, should we be paying ourselves for our performance last year? And we thought the answer was no. We recognize the hardships on our

people, and we don't take that lightly. But we believe as a whole that the hardships on others are in many cases

4 And then on the next page, in explaining the 2019 5 STIP, he explains some of the changes. I won't go over it 6 I briefed it ad nauseam for you, I think, in our brief. 7 But I focus on the very next paragraph after the bullet points 8 on the STIP. And he says, "It is also important to remind you 9 that we recognize and appreciate the hard work so many of you 10 put in last year. That's why we will go ahead with merit 11 increases in base pay in March." And he's referring to last

month, base pay increases for the performance in 2018.

With that in mind, Your Honor, I'd like to discuss the dollar amounts that are really involved over the past several years.

THE COURT: Hold on. If I could pause you for a minute. I mean, do you believe that last highlighted sentence is inconsistent with the STIP that's on the table or consistent?

MR. JULIAN: No, no. I think that the fact that they're --

22 THE COURT: It's consistent with it?

MR. JULIAN: -- they're adding three percent, I think,

24 is an important additive --

THE COURT: Okay.

3

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

significantly greater."

MR. JULIAN: -- that helps the employees and militates against some of the arguments they're making about, well, our employees are -- might be underpaid. But I'm going to get to that in a moment.

What I'd like to do next is summarize what I think he said which is first it's performance-based. Second, it must be at risk because of non-performance. Third, the current STIP system scores the company at an above-target performance of 1.5 even though its equipment kills and destroys. And --

THE COURT: Where are you reading it? You're not on the same document; you're reading something else?

MR. JULIAN: No. I'm saying that when he says --

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. JULIAN: -- they got a 1.5 on page 2, I mean, let's face it, they scored themselves a 1.5 in performance the year they killed eighty-six people -- their equipment killed eighty-six people. And I think that's what Mr. Laffredi is talking about when he says the metrics have -- the scoring process hasn't been disclosed and hasn't been fixed. We're convinced of that.

THE COURT: Well, but I have to take issue with one thing. And that's not to minimize the tragedies. Mr. Laffredi wasn't talking about tragedies; he was talking about a formula that's not clear. And he's --

MR. JULIAN: That's what I'm talking about.

1 THE COURT: Okay. And you're -- but you're focusing 2 on one of the most significant of the many tragedies and saying 3 there. I mean, I'm just trying to follow your line of thinking 4 here. 5 MR. JULIAN: Well, what I'm saying there, Your Honor, 6 is that is evidence. I am offering that as evidence that, as 7 Mr. Simon, the interim CEO said, is even though they hit their 8 1.5 metric as a whole in equity, in good conscience you 9 shouldn't be paying out a performance --10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. JULIAN: -- bonus. And as I'm going to mention in 12 a moment, I will give you some, by the way, recommendations at 13 the conclusion today of where I think we go with this. 14 THE COURT: Well, you did in your papers, too. 15 I want you to do that because I want suggestions. that's fine. 16 MR. JULIAN: The next point he makes is that the 17 company should not pay out performance bonuses ahead of 18 thousands of fire claimants. And then he talks about 19 hardship --20 THE COURT: That's -- now, again --21 MR. JULIAN: -- for employees. And --22 THE COURT: -- I took issue not with what Mr. Simon 23 says. He says what he says. But your arguments, which are 24 emphatic and forceful, you keep putting the word bonus in 25 there. And the words bonus -- you may call it a bonus, but the

1 | word bonus isn't in the STIP itself, right? And --

2 MR. JULIAN: The word bonus is -- I'm getting ahead of

3 myself. I'm happy to answer the question.

THE COURT: Well, no. You can --

5 MR. JULIAN: The word bonus is not. The PE&C, in its

December of 2018 order, adopted the Northstar report in which

7 the Northstar report -- let's face it, one of the best

8 consultants around, said this is essentially a bonus program.

9 That's right there. We quoted it in our brief. And I maintain

10 | that any compensation payment that's conditioned on performance

11 that could be moved up and down is a bonus.

But performance, incentive plan, bonus, in my view,
it's all the same. It focuses upon performance. And as CEO

14 Simon said, no matter what the metrics are, if the performance

is not good overall, we shouldn't be paying it. That's my only

16 point there, Your Honor.

4

15

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. JULIAN: With that background, I'd like to look at

what they actually did. And that relates to the two

demonstrative exhibits which I have handed up to Your Honor.

One is entitled PG&E annual STIP payments as percentage, 2019

22 plan at max, from 2013 to 2020.

Our financial advisor, Lincoln, has taken the 2020

general rate case information from our Exhibit C-18 and has

25 broken out the information on two things, Your Honor, and then

- 1 given a conclusion. First, the --
- THE COURT: Hold on. Just let me catch up with you
- 3 because I'm looking at -- I think I saw this in one of your
- 4 papers, but I --
- 5 MR. JULIAN: So, Your Honor, we've changed it. This
- 6 is a new --
- 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's even more -- slow down
- 8 | for just a second. So --
- 9 MR. JULIAN: Your Honor, may I hold out the one I'm
- 10 looking at? It's the one with --
- 11 THE COURT: Oh, yeah. No.
- 12 MR. JULIAN: -- the multi bars.
- 13 THE COURT: I'm looking at it too. I am.
- MR. JULIAN: Okay. So --
- 15 THE COURT: I'm just -- just give me one second. So
- 16 I'm looking across the board. And the blue bars are the actual
- 17 | stuff. And then we get to projected stuff. And then --
- 18 MR. JULIAN: So --
- 19 THE COURT: -- the red one is the withdrawn program
- 20 for this year that just passed. And this is -- okay. Then the
- 21 green are the targets for the -- all right. Go ahead. I got
- 22 you.
- 23 MR. JULIAN: So what we have here is on this first
- chart, we show the actual STIP payments in 2013, 2014, '15,
- 25 116, 117 and then some projected payments per the rate case

- 1 testimony for '18, '19, and '20, and then the withdrawn STIP.
- 2 I'd like to stop there.
- What I had done, Your Honor, is calculated the average
- 4 STIP actually paid out in 2013 through 2017 plus what they
- 5 | would have paid out if they had not withdrawn it in 2018. And
- 6 someone may correct me, but the average STIP payment was 155
- 7 | million dollars. That's historical.
- 8 THE COURT: You're just taking the average of the
- 9 actual --
- 10 MR. JULIAN: Those six years of payments.
- 11 THE COURT: -- the actual six years of -- well, five
- 12 plus the red, the withdrawn one, right?
- 13 MR. JULIAN: Right.
- 14 THE COURT: Five actual, one withdrawn.
- MR. JULIAN: 155 million. That's what they actually
- 16 | paid out or would have paid out if they had the -- paid out
- 17 | last year. It's about 160-, 162- if you ignore last year's
- 18 potential STIP.
- 19 THE COURT: Okay.
- 20 MR. JULIAN: And the target STIP for 2019 --
- 21 THE COURT: Does the -- where are the LTIP program
- 22 | that was on the books and was in place in these prior years?
- 23 It's not in place going forward. In other words, these
- 24 | tables -- and again, I'm -- because I'm just learning from you
- 25 | for the first time, aren't they misleading in the sense that

1 they're incomplete because there's 400 employees who were

2 participants in the equity-based LTIP that --

MR. JULIAN: Yeah, right.

THE COURT: -- that aren't going to get it but will be

5 going into the green? So they're a part of the green for --

6 MR. JULIAN: Right.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE COURT: -- going forward, right? So you got to either put them back into the blues or take them out of the green to be apples to apples, don't you or not?

MR. JULIAN: It depends whether you think that a long-term incentive plan should be in a short-term STIP that's movable. I --

THE COURT: Well, it's movable. But what I'd ask --

THE COURT: -- Mr. Karotkin about was that -- or just

MR. JULIAN: I contend it's not.

musing on my own is that -- and this really -- frankly, this goes back to my basic question that I should have known from a bankruptcy eighteen years ago. PG&E Corp is a public company. And so when I read in a STIP that there's an equity component, that suggests to me that, under the prior regime, some people

got some equity. And under the new regime, no one is going to

get any inequity. But instead, they're getting some -- more

23 money. So --

MR. JULIAN: May I answer that?

THE COURT: Well, no. Do I have it right? Just tell

1 | me if I've got it right, and then of course you can answer it.

2 MR. JULIAN: Yes and no.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. JULIAN: The yes is some people are not getting

5 the long-term incentive plan.

THE COURT: Correct.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JULIAN: So if you believe that a long-term incentive plan of equity can be put into a short-term plan and consistent with the objectives of a short-term plan, I guess I should include -- I can tell you what it is. It's 72 million dollars. But may I tell you our view on that, which is that -- calling Professors Slane (phonetic) and Kripkes (phonetic) -- now we're going to back to Patrick Murphy now -- view on equity that when you get equity as part of a program, you bargain for equity-type returns in exchange for equity losses. And it's the very antithesis of short-term monetary compensation.

THE COURT: Well, I mean --

MR. JULIAN: It's a long-term plan. And I don't think it belongs in the STIP.

THE COURT: But it's not. I mean, but I -- see, I take a more simple analysis by saying if you have two things to give to your worker force, one is called equity or share of the stock and one is called cash, they're two different things. If you take away the procedure of giving equity either because you're in bankruptcy or because the district court doesn't

- 1 think much of dealing with dividends or for any other reasons,
- 2 but instead you tell the people I'm not giving you any stock
- 3 this year, I'm giving you money, that's just a tradeoff. And
- 4 that is what it is. That's all.
- 5 So you don't disagree with that; that's just the --
- 6 MR. JULIAN: No.
- 7 THE COURT: -- pure logic. But what did you say the
- 8 | 72 million is? That's your calculation of the switch of the
- 9 equity?
- 10 MR. JULIAN: That's our FAs. So if you --
- THE COURT: Yeah, okay. Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: If you took the 72- -- you would take the
- 13 | 72 million out of my 235- and my 350 million.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: But here's the --
- 16 THE COURT: But that's really what I was -- so that's
- 17 | a simple way of saying if we want to make these things more
- comparable, maybe we have to lower those green tables a little
- 19 | bit. But --
- MR. JULIAN: I get it.
- 21 THE COURT: -- go ahead with your argument.
- MR. JULIAN: We think that the STIP is really a
- 23 | 350-million-dollar STIP for the following reasons. Even when
- 24 the company doesn't perform under a commonsense view of
- 25 performance, such as Mr. Simon has, they score themselves 1.5.

1 And so these folks know when they created this 2019 STIP, that 2 under their metrics, they were going to score another 1.5 this 3 year. And so when they say it's 235- minimum and 350- maximum, 4 what they did was they took the 235-, multiplied it by 1.5, and 5

they came up with 350 million. That's the math.

6 And so my argument on that is that that's the real 7 number we're talking about this year. When you look at their 8 historical performance, Your Honor -- and we cited in our brief 9 that in 2017, the year their equipment caused over a dozen 10 fires in California, they scored themselves a 1.9 on wildfire 11 safety as part of a STIP that got them upwards of it looks like

about 1.52. And last year they scored themselves 1.5.

- So historically, I think they're -- we're really talking about a 350-million-dollar STIP. That's the main point of this chart.
- 16 THE COURT: Okay.

12

13

14

15

- 17 MR. JULIAN: The next chart is our view that, because 18 we think -- well, you may be ruling against me on this, that 19 we --
- 20 THE COURT: I haven't --
- 21 MR. JULIAN: -- should ignore the LTIP --
- 22 THE COURT: I haven't ruled anything. I'm just 23 learning. This is not easy stuff. And I want all the help I
- 24 can get. So --
- 25 MR. JULIAN: We think what they did here was they told

- 1 their employees you're not going to get the 2018, but we're
- 2 going to do two things for you. We're going to give you a
- 3 three percent merit raise. And second, we're going to give you
- 4 basically double in the STIP payments that we did last year,
- 5 upwards of 350 million, to compensate for the 2018. Even if
- 6 you buy the 72-million-dollar reduction, that brings it down to
- 7 around 280-. And last year's 130- plus 130- is 260-. So, I
- 8 mean, any way you cut this thing, it looks to us --
- 9 THE COURT: Well, listen. You're doing a very
- 10 thorough analytical thing. I read the brief again and again
- 11 myself. And I thought last year it was 100-something million;
- 12 this year it could be 300 million. How is that a bad deal? I
- 13 mean, what's -- who needs the 2018 numbers if you get twice as
- 14 much in 2019?
- 15 MR. JULIAN: That's what I think is going on.
- 16 THE COURT: I mean, I'm not -- I haven't made up my
- 17 mind, but I -- this is why I'm struggling to understand what's
- 18 going on here.
- 19 MR. JULIAN: And that's the purpose of that
- 20 presentation.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay.
- 22 MR. JULIAN: I turn now to our objection. And I'm not
- 23 going to repeat what I said in the brief, but I will summarize
- 24 in two respects.
- 25 I don't mean to deter you from making the THE COURT:

argument you want to make. I just wanted to say that I think
getting into a debate about whether the proponents of this plan
were in bad faith was a little harsh. And to then roll it out
to a derivative suit and conflict seems a little bit extreme --

MR. JULIAN: I get it.

THE COURT: -- because if we forget all that, you still got some very cogent arguments. And perhaps you'll carry the day. I don't know. I'm thinking about it.

Go ahead.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JULIAN: The first point I'd like to make is there is no evidence in the record before you, the Mistry or the Friske declaration or in anything that we put into evidence with the rate case that indicate that the employees are compensated below or above market. There's just no testimony.

THE COURT: Well, didn't Mr. Friske say that -- I mean, I thought he touched on that.

MR. JULIAN: As a whole. The employees as a whole --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JULIAN: -- versus each individual employee.

We're talking about -- I'm talking about individual employees.

Mistry admitted in this deposition, page 111 of the transcript, that he didn't have to talk to a single person who said his or her pay is below market.

THE COURT: Well, yeah. One of the things that's difficult for me -- this is a fast-moving process. And I get

told there's 300 pages of depositions four days before the
hearing. I just can't absorb that stuff so quickly. So I did
not read those depositions. And I can't process it all.

So he didn't -- I mean, did he even say he interviewed any employees, what their pay was?

MR. JULIAN: He didn't say that.

THE COURT: I mean, that's right.

MR. JULIAN: That's my memory.

THE COURT: So I would assume he didn't -- it's not surprising that no one told him it was underpaid because he probably never talked to anybody and asked them in the first place.

MR. JULIAN: And I think the touchstone of business judgment is asking questions. That's fundamental governance 101. They're basing this on -- we're concerned about the employees and they told to a single employee? I think that's lack of inquiry. And I'm not going to touch on bad faith or fraud. I'm not arguing that. Our brief is basically one of lack of inquiry in the face of astounding losses which I turn to next.

Your Honor, I want to tell you why we're here. We are here because if there is another fire in October or November of 2019, this Chapter 11 case could be toast.

24 THE COURT: Well, I have thought -- you and I and
25 their bankruptcy lawyers in the room know the law. And a lot

- of people don't. And we both know what could happen.
- 2 MR. JULIAN: There are arguments that it's not
- 3 administrative claim. But --
- 4 THE COURT: Well, the Supreme Court about thirty,
- 5 forty years ago said it was --
- 6 MR. JULIAN: I understand.
- 7 THE COURT: -- in the Reading case. Right?
- 8 MR. JULIAN: Right. On the first day of the
- 9 bankruptcy, come New York wonk in some article akin to
- 10 Bloomberg had a very persuasive article on the other view. But
- I understand there's a Supreme Court case on that.
- 12 THE COURT: The last time I check, I have to follow
- 13 Supreme Court.
- MR. JULIAN: Yes, Your Honor. And I want you to --
- 15 I'll withdraw that.
- I want us to discuss what's really at stake. I
- watched that fire come at my house in Sonoma for twenty-six
- 18 hours. I know what it's like. And I can tell you I am
- 19 preparing for the fire again this year. We are not convinced.
- 20 And PG&E has not convinced us in anything that they said to
- Judge Alsup or in the depositions that they are going to fix
- 22 | the system. What they said at the last hearing in front of
- Judge Alsup, at the end of the hearing, Judge Alsup said I hope
- 24 you make it.
- THE COURT: Well, we all hope.

1 MR. JULIAN: But the point is --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

2 THE COURT: You hope too, don't you? Of course.

MR. JULIAN: I hope they make it. But the point is there's conviction that they're going to make it. I'm shooting you straight on this one, Your Honor. There is no conviction among the professionals that they're going to make it. And we need to do everything we can. And this step is battle zone one in this case to make sure --

THE COURT: Well, I guess that's what you've got to convince me because there could be no STIP and there's a fire risk. And we all hope that everybody survives it. And there can be the biggest STIP in the world and no fire. So we really have -- we're not here today -- as much as I wish I could magically decree that there be no fires this year. We have to focus on whether this STIP is proper for the benefit of its beneficiaries.

And a broader question that I have asked myself five times in preparing for this hearing, and I probably will ask the lawyers on the other side today is who's going to stand up and tell me that this is more likely rather than less likely to facilitate or enhance the possibility of the company we are going to -- which is a broader question, by the way, than dealing with the fire risk. There are lots and lots of -millions and millions of other dollars of creditors who are not fire victims who are also going to have issues in this case.

Filed: 04/10/19

1 So it's a broad question that affects every body, right?

2 MR. JULIAN: I don't think we can reorganize, if

3 there's another fire. And I think we have to incentivize.

4 It's called an incentive plan. We have to incentivize the

5 employees to do what's right.

And I don't think you incentivize employees to do what's right by telling them, in this record of falsification of safety records and what they did with those trees and the gas records, to say we're going to pay you nine months' of quarterly payments before we learn whether or not Mr. Simon has to write another letter saying, you know what, our STIP metric score is 1.5. That's why I read the letter.

I am seeing this play out again. He -- we could have them score themselves 1.5 under all their metrics and 1.9 on wildfire safety, just like they did before. But the records are falsified. They're not correct.

THE COURT: Are they falsified presently? The only thing that I'm aware of that -- and again, I don't study the news like anybody else, as thoroughly as perhaps I would. If I'm not mistaken, the falsification records led to a conviction for something that happened in 2010, right? No, what was the year of the San Bruno fire? Isn't that where the falsification occurred? Am I right? I forgot the year.

MR. JULIAN: No, no. Those were the falsifications that happened with respect to San Bruno.

- 1 THE COURT: Right.
- 2 MR. JULIAN: But in December of this year, the PUC
- 3 started another investigation.
- 4 THE COURT: But there's -- there's been no conviction.
- 5 Judge Alsup's --
- 6 MR. JULIAN: I'm not talking about convictions.
- 7 MR. JULIAN: Okay. But Judge Alsup's role, following
- 8 Judge Henderson, was to preside over the criminal trial. And
- 9 that is what obviously has influenced him. Is there a
- determination that he has made that there's been falsification
- of records in this current year, current environment, post-San
- 12 Bruno?
- MR. JULIAN: You would have to ask him what he meant
- 14 by his word on January 9. I can tell you what I think it
- means.
- 16 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: First, on January 9, he said in light
- 18 of -- I'll quote it to you. This was January 9 of this year.
- 19 THE COURT: Yeah.
- 20 MR. JULIAN: Judge Alsup stated in his first OSC, "In
- 21 | light of PG&E's history of falsification of inspection reports,
- PG&E shall, between now and the 2019 wildfire season, reinspect
- 23 all of its electrical grid."
- THE COURT: No, I understand, yes, sure.
- MR. JULIAN: Now may I stop and tell you about the

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

December 2018 PUC order, which says that during the past several years there has been widespread falsification of locate and mark records. You know, when USA comes along and sprays the pavement in front of your house with white and yellow and green to show where the utilities are? They're supposed to do that within a certain period of time. And if they don't, the employees are supposed to report it. We screwed up. And the supervisors are supposed to tag them.

What that PUC order shows, based upon the report given to the PUC, staring a brand new investigation -- this is new, today. They haven't even responded. They have until June, I think it is. That the supervisors engaged in widespread falsification of records, hiding the fact that the locate and mark was late. Why did they do that? We believe, and the inference is clear, for the STIP payment.

Let me say that again. One of the metrics in the STIP is accurate recordkeeping and timeliness, timeliness. So if the striper comes and is late striping, the metric goes down and they're going to get less money. The supervisors falsify it in order to get the STIP up. This is the honest-to-God truth. And so the STIP, in this instance -- not all instances, but in this one -- that the PUC is now investigating today, not ten years ago, is whether or not the STIP incentivizes falsification of records.

So Judge Alsup says on January 9 -- and by the way, he

- superseded his OSC two months later -- he says in light of this record of falsifications, I'm not going to rely upon you anymore, PG&E, to tell me you are cutting your trees and fixing
 - This is exactly what Bob Julian, today, is saying to
 His Honorable Dennis Montali. Your Honor, we don't them today,
 just like Judge Alsup doesn't. So he's going to force them to
 have a monitor on them. Imagine that? He's got a monitor on
 them to tell him whether they're doing it right. He's got a
 probation officer to see if they are correctly reporting their
 convictions. He just convicted them on January 30, one day
 after the bankruptcy was filed, for failing to report the Butte
 District Attorney's settlement --
- 14 THE COURT: Well, he didn't convict them, did he?
- MR. JULIAN: Well, actually, I'll tell you the truth.
- 16 THE COURT: I thought he -- I thought --
- MR. JULIAN: He said convicted. It's not in the
- 18 transcript. He sustained the probation officers --
- THE COURT: Well, that's --
- 20 MR. JULIAN: He sustained the probation officers --
- 21 THE COURT: Let's just get it right, okay?
- 22 MR. JULIAN: He called it a conviction. It's not a
- 23 conviction.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

the system.

- 24 THE COURT: It's not a conviction.
- MR. JULIAN: He sustained the probation officer's

allege of violation of probation and he said sentencing on the sustaining of the violation of probation has not yet occurred.

So I come back to square one, which is this is not proper governance to -- where there have been three fires of the past four years. For the fifth year coming up, to say we're going to let ninety -- seventy-five percent of the money go out the door before we find out if we were successful this year. It is not prudent. It is reckless. That is our argument, Your Honor. And I don't think anyone can say with a straight face --

THE COURT: Well, but you're focusing now, I guess, on the quarterly temporal nature of it, rather than the annual.

But it's the same -- aren't you making the same argument? I mean, your argument is that there's an incentive here to falsify the records. Is there any different incentive -- if that's true and this is your argument, if it's true, what difference does it make if it's quarterly or annually?

MR. JULIAN: I think they've got to fix the falsification of records by having an investigation, which they haven't done, and fire the employees who falsified records.

THE COURT: Yeah, but who says they won't? In other words, you want me to -- I'm not going to use a word like "indict", but you want me to make a sweeping decision that affects 10,000 employees --

MR. JULIAN: No.

THE COURT: -- and some number of them maybe are culpable, but the rest are not.

MR. JULIAN: Your Honor, for thirty years -- I have an answer for that. For thirty years, the annual payment worked out pretty well.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JULIAN: They picked the quarterly payment in the year, the fifth year, where we're looking at another fire. What a time to change it.

THE COURT: Well, I understand. I understand. but it's also the first year in eighteen that they've been in bankruptcy. And you know that the rules change in bankruptcy, even -- even for companies that don't get in fires. You know, as well as I, and any experienced bankruptcy lawyer knows that it's a different environment and there's a lot of things that happen and a lot of rules that are changed and a lot of uncertainty.

So I can't forget that. I can't -- and I'm not making light of all the things you're saying. But I'm also saying, aren't we painting with a very broad brush here for a huge number of people that are the guys out in the field in South San Francisco, fixing short circuit breakers, just doing their job like everybody else?

24 MR. JULIAN: Those folks -- I have firsthand experience with those guys. They are doing their job.

- 1 THE COURT: Yeah, they are.
- 2 MR. JULIAN: The supervisors and managers, there's a
- 3 big question mark.
- 4 THE COURT: Well, okay, but how -- what am I supposed
- 5 to do here?
- 6 MR. JULIAN: Send it back for them to fix it.
- 7 | Don't --
- 8 THE COURT: For them to fix the metrics and the --
- 9 MR. JULIAN: Well --
- 10 THE COURT: Judge Alsup will handle what he handles.
- 11 I'm not doing his job. He's not doing mine. So my -- do you
- want me to, not fine-tune, rebuild the STIP.
- MR. JULIAN: I don't want you to rebuild it. I
- 14 | think --
- THE COURT: No, I know. You want me to order them to
- 16 do it.
- MR. JULIAN: Yes, yes, Your Honor. And I would like
- 18 to turn to Mr. Laffreti's comment, although I'm going to build
- 19 on it a little bit. And that is that, look, this is a layup.
- 20 You don't have any evidence in front of you, other than the
- 21 | fact that it's a layup.
- THE COURT: Well, we know the judge who did the layup
- 23 is a basketball fan.
- MR. JULIAN: They routinely -- well --
- 25 THE COURT: Yes, it is. I got --

MR. JULIAN: There was a good game last night in overtime, too. But Your Honor, look, in 2017 they scored themselves a 1.9 above perfect on a lot of fire safety. And 1.5 last year overall. They're going to get another 1.5, no matter -- even if there's a fire. And there has to be a message sent to PG&E and its employees that this is serious.

I know some of the people are taking this serious, but there's a culture there that doesn't do the right thing. Let me give an example. It's the truth, too. From my experience, they've got a bunch of transformers out there. They're twenty or thirty years old. Part of the problem that PG&E has is cutting up trees. And it looks like they're making progress. I can tell you my own experience, 1,000 feet above the Sonoma Hills. They're cutting branches like crazy.

But I had a transformer blow last year. I'll tell you how it happened, actually. A squirrel gets up -- there's two terminals: the hot and the neutral. And if the squirrel eats the one terminal rubber away and as he's eating the other one, he touches the thing, he creates a bridge. There's a spark. Thing goes out --

THE COURT: No squirrel.

MR. JULIAN: Exactly. They came to fix it. They said, here's what happened, Mr. Julian. I said, is there a dead squirrel up there? They said no, but at the bottom of the telephone there is. What are you going to do about it? We're

- going to give you a new transformer. This is an old one. They
- 2 were up there yesterday again, looking at the post again.
- 3 THE COURT: Yeah, but we want them doing that.
- 4 MR. JULIAN: Exactly.
- 5 THE COURT: Let's get to the --
- 6 MR. JULIAN: Next door to me is the same old
- 7 transformer. They don't replace a lot of the equipment until
- 8 | it breaks. Violation of governance 101A. You've got to
- 9 replace it at the end of its useful life, rather than waiting
- 10 for it to break, obsolescence. They have a --
- 11 THE COURT: But seriously, this is for the PUC. This
- 12 is for the regulars. I mean, this is not something that I can
- 13 believe you. I've known you for a long time. I've never known
- 14 you to falsify or exaggerate, which is what we all do. That's
- 15 | fine. But I can't say to the debtor, no STIP until you replace
- 16 | all the --
- MR. JULIAN: No, you can't. And I'm not suggesting
- 18 that.
- 19 THE COURT: -- transformers in Sonoma County.
- 20 MR. JULIAN: But I am suggesting that you need
- 21 evidence in front of you, Your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: As to whether or not this is a layup.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: They have to come in with a sheet that

- they apparently gave to the unsecured creditors' committee and
- 2 have not given to me when they settled with them, that shows
- 3 what their scoring is --
- 4 THE COURT: Well, I was going to ask --
- 5 MR. JULIAN: -- and what their procedures are.
- 6 THE COURT: -- because I got through --
- 7 MR. JULIAN: It's not in front of you.
- 8 THE COURT: I got the -- no, I know it's not in front
- 9 of me. I got the report yesterday that the unsecured
- 10 | creditors' committee reached a deal, but I did -- my question
- 11 was are you even aware of it?
- MR. JULIAN: Yeah.
- THE COURT: Okay. Well, I mean, aware of what they
- filed but no more than that? Or are you aware of --
- MR. JULIAN: I am -- I am not aware of the scoring
- 16 process --
- 17 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JULIAN: -- or the exact metrics, other than HR VP
- 19 Mistry testifying in his deposition that for wildfire safety
- 20 | it's based on miles.
- THE COURT: Well as I said earlier, my problem is, A,
- I can't possibly absorb the volume of stuff in the last four
- 23 days. But even if so, getting it in the -- your taking of your
- 24 opponents experts deposition is hardly a way to get facts so
- 25 that I can make any sense about it or frankly, anyone else can

make sense about it in that timeframe. So I share with you the idea that you've gotten -- get some information, but it wasn't there -- even that in the moving papers.

MR. JULIAN: And I still don't have it today. And here's the point. PG&E number one, ten years ago, incentive plan, retention plan comes in front of you, is anyone going to argue about this? Probably not. But we have had --

THE COURT: No, there was some argument about it then, believe me.

MR. JULIAN: But now, Your Honor, we have had three fires in four years. This is a special case.

THE COURT: I know.

MR. JULIAN: We need to make sure that our heads aren't chopped off, my head's not chopped off some day if there's another fire and we have not insisted that these folks show us how they are scoring their incentive program to tell their employees to fix the system, especially where Judge Alsup says as recently as two months ago, in light of your recent falsifications -- I'm reading that in. I think he's referring to the PUC. I don't know that for a fact, that we need new inspections.

And I'm saying to you, Your Honor, just like Judge

Alsup needs them to inspect now and certify to him, I need them

to tell us what are their metrics for scoring? Are they going

to have a layup or are they really going to have some teeth?

- 1 Is it 10,000 miles? Is it 5,000 miles? Is it a mile? I can
- 2 read the wildfire plan that they filed with the PUC. It looks
- 3 pretty good to me, as far as it goes. But I don't know what
- 4 their metrics are for scoring it.
- 5 Your Honor, the settlement with the unsecured
- 6 creditors' committee, they have changed the ten percent
- 7 | wildfire safety metric to twenty-five percent.
- 8 THE COURT: As I understand it, they were adjusting
- 9 the financial performance downward and the wildfire, particular
- 10 one, up.
- 11 MR. JULIAN: Yes.
- 12 THE COURT: That's what it does. And then some other
- 13 tweaks on some things that I don't quite understand. But I see
- 14 them in those papers, right?
- MR. JULIAN: Right, right. It doesn't go as far as we
- 16 | believe it should go. I believe a prudent -- I believe Judge
- 17 | Alsup wouldn't be a prudent director. And if you can read
- between the lines of what he's saying, it looks to me like they
- 19 | should've just flipped the financial performance with the
- wildfire safety 1040.
- 21 THE COURT: Right. That's what I read. That's what I
- 22 said. But that is a change. I mean --
- MR. JULIAN: It is a change.
- THE COURT: You might not think it's enough. See, Mr.
- Julian, I can't translate this to real numbers. I don't have

1 any one of those 10,000 people to tell me what that means to

2 him or her. Because to me, adjusting metrics and multipliers

3 and factors and what's that other word that was used -- I

4 forget -- in there?

5 MR. JULIAN: Individual performance modifier?

6 THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, that's all fine. It sounds

good. I have no idea what it means, though. And I guess maybe

8 you do.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

7

9 MR. JULIAN: That's my point.

10 THE COURT: Maybe you do, but I don't.

MR. JULIAN: No, we don't.

12 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Mistry, I'm sure does.

13 MR. JULIAN: I know --

14 THE COURT: And Mr. Friske knows. But I don't.

15 MR. JULIAN: We know what the intent of the individual

16 performance modifier is. I think that was one of the most

17 | egregious things. They've now fixed it, but at the end of the

18 | year. What good does it do to take an employee up or down

19 based on his performance in the first nine months if the

20 money's already out the door? Three-fourths of this money will

21 be out the door, essentially two times -- in nine months, if

22 they make their 350 million dollar STIP amount for this year,

23 they will have paid out, in nine months, on a quarterly basis,

24 two times the 2018 STIP amount of 130 million.

25 THE COURT: But let's have an even bigger picture.

What if there were no STIP? All those employees who stayed
employed would be getting compensation at some level of X. I
don't know what the X is. Is it eighty-five percent? Ninety
percent? I don't know. What does -- I believe in one of the
papers I read, there's a range that the STIP might represent
fifteen percent of an individual employee's compensation. Is
that -- did you read that? Did you get that right or --

MR. JULIAN: Six to twenty percent.

THE COURT: Six to twenty, but fifteen is an inbetween one. Okay, so if there were no STIP, it means the
people that are on the job doing their job, hopefully
conscientiously, will be getting eighty to some other level
percentage of their pay anyway.

MR. JULIAN: That's where I disagree. And I disagree because of -- we've all been snowed, in my view.

THE COURT: Well, okay.

MR. JULIAN: Judge, CEO Simon says -- that's why I read his email. This is a great admission. He said it's not guaranteed.

20 THE COURT: Well --

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

21 MR. JULIAN: It's totally at risk.

THE COURT: Well, and you -- well, isn't that true? I mean, it might be a palace revolt if the management says, by the way, we said we're going to pay you, but we're not. But look, let's base it down to basic California labor law. If

your employer says your compensation is X plus an incentive bonus of Y, they can't stiff you on X. You get your pay or you --

4 MR. JULIAN: That's my point.

THE COURT: They'll put them in jail. The wage -- the labor commission will put them in jail. But if the last percentage that is discretionary, that's not a snow job. That's just -- you get it or they don't under certain circumstances, right?

MR. JULIAN: Right. So that's why -- it all depends how you sit, whether you -- when you hear their words, it's part of their normal compensation. If what that means is incentive pay and base pay is part of the compensation, I agree with them. But if what it means is it's part of your normal compensation, such that if we don't pay it to you, you're under market according to your peers, I disagree with that. Because there's no evidence of that in front of you.

THE COURT: Well, but there is evidence from your chart that, for at least the last several years, the employees have been getting a STIP and, or an LTIP or the equity piece.

So it -- and this isn't a case where the company files bankruptcy and says, let's now have a new incentive plan. This is an incentive plan that's been in place for long -- I believe even more than the years that are on your chart, I think. And what you're taking issue with is the context of the fires and

- 1 | the horrible damage --
- 2 MR. JULIAN: Yes.
- 3 THE COURT: -- plus the increase. It sounds to me
- 4 like that -- not that you, personally -- I don't know what your
- 5 own personal view is, but your committee would have less to
- 6 | complain about if it were essentially the same as the past.
- 7 MR. JULIAN: If it were the same as the past, they'd
- 8 have less to concern (sic) about?
- 9 THE COURT: I mean, obviously they'd be --
- MR. JULIAN: We'd be left with one issue?
- 11 THE COURT: No, the issue is about safety and Judge
- 12 Alsup's point of view and so on are what they are.
- MR. JULIAN: Because this is not your typical
- 14 bankruptcy case.
- 15 THE COURT: It's not your typical bankruptcy.
- MR. JULIAN: And we cannot let the debtor, in my view,
- 17 get away without telling us, is the process still in place that
- permitted you to score yourself overall 1.5 last year, overall
- company performance, and 1.9 in wildfire safety in 2017, the
- 20 | year of total destruction in Sonoma, Napa? I need that
- 21 | evidence, Your Honor. And that's -- send it back. That's what
- I think they've got to do. They've got to do those two things.
- Did you change the system that allowed you to score
- yourself so high? That's number one. And two, what are the
- 25 specific scoring metrics, specifically, for wildfire safety,

recordkeeping, accurate recordkeeping and the like? Because we have this continuing problem of some supervisors and managers falsifying records. They need to fix that, too. I don't really mean to denigrate nuclear safety, but it looks like nuclear safety is doing quite well in California. Our problem is, as Judge Alsup said, three percent of the state burning up and over a hundred people being killed.

Lastly, Your Honor, the second to the last point, the total dollar payout, in our view, is not appropriate in a reorganization. 350 million in the history of having 155, even if you add in the LTIP, which I don't think is appropriate.

Why not half a million? Why not a million, I mean, a billion?

Where's it stop? It's just out of sync with the historical STIP program that they have and is, therefore, suspect and not appropriate.

THE COURT: Well, again, you're saying that you'd like to see the detail behind the metrics and how does it work and how does this -- your argument is that this self-scoring thing is inflated and it's a laugh. And if you had the ability to draft it yourself or with your advisors to something that is more traditional, I gather you're not still -- you're not opposed to some kind of program like this, as long as it has some safety features. You know what I mean, built-in corrections or adjustments.

MR. JULIAN: We do have one concern.

1 THE COURT: Right.

MR. JULIAN: May I get to it in a moment and finish on this one point? If you do send it back for further work, I would say -- recognizing it's a bankruptcy case -- there's no harm. We're very early in this bankruptcy case. They just finished the first quarter.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JULIAN: I could sit down with them and turn out new STIP metrics in two weeks. That doesn't address -- and historically that shouldn't be a problem even though they're in bankruptcy, because they've waited until February of the next year to make the payment. But I understand Your Honor's comments about incentivizing people in a bankruptcy.

THE COURT: Well, look, the timing of payment -there's a certain concept that's got to be right, that's got to
look right. And there is a fear that I have, and you're
expressing it, that some people who shouldn't be getting
compensated might be compensated improperly or prematurely.
But again, I am not prepared to put 10,000 people in this
basket of wrong-doers.

MR. JULIAN: Neither am I.

THE COURT: And so the question is, why is that bad to do for the vast majority of the people that, A, have no involvement in the problem and, B, even if they did, there's no indication that they've done anything wrong?

1 MR. JULIAN: Two reasons: first, it's improper 2 governance not to investigate when you find out that you're --

3 THE COURT: Improper governance not to investigate, I
4 share with you.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

MR. JULIAN: Yeah. And secondly, everyone involved in this case, I believe, from the professionals, certainly Judge Alsup is doing it, and I would ask Your Honor to do it, should be sending a message, I believe, to these folks that it's not business as usual. This is serious enough -- I would ask you to rule that this is serious enough, the potential fire in 2019 that could debilitate this case and kill another hundred people, is serious enough that we're not going to do Mr. Julian business as usual and approve a STIP that some people deserve until they fix the systemic problem --

THE COURT: Mr. Julian, I would leave the bench here in thirty seconds, saying motion denied, if I could know that by denying the STIP motion, I could avoid the fire in 2019.

That's the problem. All the STIPs in the world aren't going to prevent the fire if something is causing -- well, aren't going to prevent the fire. And your argument is persuasive that maybe there's some wrongdoing and maybe the kind of conduct that Judge Alsup most recently is focused on and the PUC focused on and others have focused on, it needs to be deterred. But there still might be a horrible fire that has nothing to do with PG&E, that creates the same bankruptcy dilemma.

So I've got to figure out what to do about that. In other words, if I could magically say to the debtor, you've got a great STIP, just get rid of all the wrong people, the bad people, they still might have a fire and we still might have --

MR. JULIAN: They still might, but as Judge Alsup said, we have to start here.

THE COURT: Yeah, we do. But the question is does tweaking the STIP fix it? It might send the message. I agree with you. But does it fix it? I don't know. And I'm looking for help.

MR. JULIAN: Tweaking the STIP on wildfire safety metrics, by definition, is required and so it must help. And then last, but not least, CEO Simon stated something that I want to address. He stated at the end of the second page of his email that he recognizes the hardship on the people that you, Your Honor, just said you were worried about, the rank and file employees out there who deserve some compensation. He said, we don't take that lightly.

But here's the CEO talking about what is prudent in corporate governance, in my view. He says, we believe as a whole that the hardships on others are, in many cases, significantly greater. He's referring to our clients, Your Honor. And I know you probably don't want to hear from me about grandstanding, but I have to tell you the perspective of my committee.

1

THE COURT: I want you to. You're not grandstanding. 2 MR. JULIAN: I went out there two weeks ago, well, we 3 all did. The whole Baker team went out and spent the day with 4 our financial advisors, with the eleven victims on our 5 committee, and we toured Paradise for the day. I was in the 6 truck of one of the committee members, whose house was burned 7 down. He took me to it, complete devastation. On the way up, 8 I saw a couple living in a trailer on their property, with 9 their brick chimney still there, with four-by-four vats of 10 water out front, that that's how they get their water from, 11 with the dog barking like crazy. What a stressful way. 12 Because he can't live in the yard anymore. This is how they 13 are living. 14 One of our victims on our committee is living in a 15 trailer -- I'm sorry, a tent down by the river, adjacent to 16 where her house burned down. And I believe we have to send the 17 corporate message here. The debtor -- and you've read it in 18 the news, you've heard about it, probably, about this hundred-19 million-dollar fund for victims. What I would've done in this 20 case is pay out the hundred million dollars to the victims 21 first, to help them with their trailers and their tents. 22 THE COURT: I don't know what you're referring to, 23 actually. 24 MR. JULIAN: And their food. Well, there can be a 25 fund set up.

THE COURT: But it's not something that's come before this Court, right?

MR. JULIAN: Well --

THE COURT: I'm not aware of it. It's okay. I mean, if it happens, that's how it happens. But I don't know what has happened.

MR. JULIAN: We need to send a message that they need to do the right thing. And CEO Simon had it correct in our view, when he said we should not be paying ourselves before these victims who are under different hardship. And I talked to the victims and I want to read to you one statement by a victim, from a different fire, but when I read it to my clients in this case, they said that encapsulates what we are living with. And this is from the legal assistant to Pat Murphy (phonetic), of all people, a partner who hired me out of law school, whose house burned down in another utility district. But this synthesizes the same views of the clients on my committee who have lived through the same things.

And she said, "On the day of the fire, I had never been happier. I think of myself then like a picture in sharp focus. Since the fire, I am more like a mosaic. Day-by-day, piece-by-piece, putting myself together again, attempting to recover who I was on that fateful day. But like a mosaic, the fire has left cracks in my heart, soul and mind that can never be erased. And I will never be the same again."

And just as CEO Simon predicted, for the thousands of victims out there, to see incentive pay, bonus pay for performance, before we even learn if it started another fire, is an insult. It's not right. And I think CEO Simon said it best when he said we shouldn't be doing this for 2018. And our committee and our professionals believe they shouldn't be doing it for 2019 either.

However, if Your Honor believes that some part of this case should be typical and we should incentivize some employees, we believe you should send the STIP back for reconfiguration so that we can be sure the metrics are appropriately scored and administered.

THE COURT: Before you leave, I want to put one question back to you. Again, as I said a minute ago, I wish I could magically decree that there will be no fires in 2019. I can't do that. So whether there will be a fire in 2019 or not is not something that I can deal with.

But the question that I don't know and I can't insist that the debtors' lawyers and representatives answer the question yet, is when and how they're going to compensate the victims and pay the creditors, who aren't victims, but who are creditors. And that's a different question.

And so if we could magically say no more fires, we still have to decide what to do about the employees who are doing their job at a time when the company needs to get itself

out of bankruptcy. And if there'd never been the fires, again,
the same story, the company would still be told figure out a
way to get out of bankruptcy. It wouldn't be as difficult, but
they'd still have to do it. They did it before. They can do

it again, we hope.

So I have to juggle the emotions that you described so vividly, correctly, and impressively. But how do I relate that to the issue at hand and what we talked about? So you made your point and I'll take your comments and I'll listen to the others and figure out what's the best thing to do. Thank you for a very good presentation.

MR. JULIAN: I do have an answer for that, Your Honor.

I would need -- and I think you would need -- more information
on several things. Base pay, I think I put it in my
conclusion --

THE COURT: No, you did, you did.

MR. JULIAN: What's the base pay elsewhere? What are the individual incentives? What's it for? It's just more information. I do understand that they've done this on a very high level. At a very high level, talking about their peers and everything may be good for the typical bankruptcy case. But this is not the typical bankruptcy case, Your Honor, I submit. We have to do something more in this case. And I think you need more information, as do we.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Julian.

1 MR. JULIAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: I'm going to call on counsel for the SLF fire victims, if you wish to be heard. And then I'll take a short break and then call on anyone else who wants to be heard in opposition to the motion.

MR. HAWKINS: Good morning, Your Honor. Chris Hawkins of Sullivan Hill, on behalf of approximately 3,500 --

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hawkins.

MR. HAWKINS: -- fire victims, known as the Singleton claimants. I'll be very brief, Your Honor. We have joined in the other oppositions. We have our own file.

Part of the frustration and sensitivity on our clients' parts with the STIP issue, you hinted at it just a minute ago. They face a significant weight here now, in terms of getting the compensation they need to rebuild their homes and their lives and their communities. They're easily going to wait a year or two, realistically, in this case before they get paid. Some of those folks have already been waiting more than three years.

THE COURT: No, I know. Your one group, particularly, we talked about that before.

MR. HAWKINS: Correct, goes back to 2015. And so now they face another year or two of waiting on top of that. And they face a second issue and that is after that lengthy wait, are they going to get paid in full? And this is the issue you

1 raised a moment ago.

We questioned the debtor at the 341 on that issue: are you going to pay in full in this case? And despite the operating report showing assets, billions of dollars in excess of liabilities, and despite a stock price showing essentially the same thing, PG&E said they couldn't commit to that at this point. And for our clients to hear that they might not be paid in full after going through all this is particular painful.

THE COURT: Well, they didn't predict anything, did they?

MR. HAWKINS: Correct.

THE COURT: Again, I wasn't privy to that. But I know from experience what it takes to figure out how to formulate a plan for even the poorest and bankrupt of company, not a company that on paper is solvent.

MR. HAWKINS: As do I and I sympathize with debtors' counsel for having -- I know what they have ahead of them there, but at the same time, for our clients to have to sit where they sit and hear about bonuses being paid is particularly painful. And in terms of where we are on the full pay issue, we started the case with people pointing to the stock price, saying looks like there's going to be assets left in excess of liabilities.

We now have the operating report starting to hit the docket showing the same thing. If this case progresses to the

point where PG&E starts putting in pleadings, we are working towards a full pay case, our clients' sensitivities may shift a little bit. But from where we sit right now, that's why we filed the objection to the STIP.

THE COURT: But seriously, we can stipulate -everybody would agree this is a horribly unusual case. But in
the first bankruptcy, in the first PG&E case, not driven by any
major fires -- there were some tort claims, but not
significant -- from day one it was obvious that the company was
solvent. And it was pretty obvious to me, as the presiding
judge, that creditors were going to get paid. It took a long
time, but they got paid.

And that's not typical in most of the relatively small bankruptcies that I handle every day and most of the bankruptcy lawyers here in the room, at least locally, handle. So I'm still optimistic that the company will be able to pay its creditors in full. But I'm not going to hold them to a deadline. I'm not going to tell them they're going to have to have their plan on file next week or next month.

But let's get back to the immediate time. You seem to be recognizing that it probably will take a while. What do I do in the short-term, from your point of view, with the 10,000 employees who -- most of whom had nothing to do with the problem and most of whom are just trying to get -- do their job?

```
1
              MR. HAWKINS: We're sympathetic to the rank and file
 2
     workers, Your Honor. But the reality is there's a lot of pain
 3
     to go around in this bankruptcy case. And we would submit that
 4
     going a year --
 5
              THE COURT: But what I have to be blunt about, as much
 6
     as I wish it weren't so, I could deny the entire STIP and that
 7
     doesn't put one dollar into your clients' pockets for now. And
 8
     maybe it will or maybe it won't some day in the future, but
9
     that's a different question.
10
              MR. HAWKINS: Understood. But it would lessen our
     clients' pain on this issue.
11
12
              THE COURT: Okay.
13
              MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: Well, I said I was going to take a break,
15
     but let me ask just other counsel wanting to appear in
16
     opposition to the motion. Is there anyone left that wants to
17
     be heard? If there's only one or two, I'll do it.
18
              Do you want to be heard?
19
              MR. DEGHETALDI: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, before you come to the
21
     podium, is there anyone else? All right. I'll take --
22
              MR. TREDINNICK: Your Honor --
23
              MS. PINO: Your Honor --
24
              THE COURT: Oh, who's on the phone?
25
              MR. TREDINNICK: Edward Tredinnick --
```

- 1 MS. PINO: Good morning, Your Honor.
- 2 MR. TREDINNICK: -- on behalf of the City and County
- 3 of San Francisco.
- 4 THE COURT: Okay. And the woman? Who's that?
- 5 MS. PINO: Good morning, Your Honor. Estela Pion on
- 6 behalf of the superior court-appointed executive committee for
- 7 the Ghost Ship plaintiff cases.
- 8 THE COURT: Okay, okay. Ms. Pino and Mr. Tredinnick,
- 9 I've read your papers. I will let you speak after the
- gentleman who came up to the podium.
- 11 I'm going to ask you to keep your comments relatively
- brief. But I will go ahead and not take a break. I'll try to
- 13 | see if we can get these three speakers out of the way first, so
- 14 yes, sir? Gentleman at the podium?
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Thank you, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: I need a name.
- 17 MR. DEGHETALDI: Name's Dario DeGhetaldi, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Oh, yes. You were here before. I'm
- 19 | sorry, I didn't recognize you.
- 20 THE COURT: That's all right. Your Honor, our office
- 21 | represents over 1,600 victims of the camp fire, as well as
- 22 hundreds of others of disasters caused by PG&E, going back to
- 23 the San Bruno explosion, in 2010.
- I have a couple of comments. Generally, I'd like to
- 25 say that we support the remarks of both the U.S. Trustee and

- 1 the tort claimants' committee. There are a few factual issues
- 2 that I'd like to inform the Court about. Mr. Julian touched on
- 3 some of them. But I have a little bit more history.
- I have here, Your Honor, an order from Judge Alsup
- 5 that was entered on April 3rd.
- 6 THE COURT: I think I've seen that. Someone else has
- 7 already provided me with that. You can give me another copy,
- 8 but I'm aware of it.
- 9 MR. DEGHETALDI: This is an order modifying conditions
- of PG&E's probation, requiring PG&E to comply with the law,
- 11 | requiring PG&E to comply with orders of the CPUC and other
- 12 issues. After that hearing, Your Honor, further investigatory
- authority was given to the monitor to look into other matters
- 14 that extend beyond the scope of Judge Henderson's original
- order, creating the monitorship.
- And I'd like to just make a couple of comments about
- 17 | the locate and mark program. That program --
- 18 THE COURT: What's the name? I'm not familiar with
- 19 the term.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: I'm sorry, locate and mark.
- 21 That's -- Mr. Julian talked about that, explaining --
- 22 THE COURT: Oh, okay. I thought you were referring to
- 23 some people's names.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: No, no.
- THE COURT: Locate and mark.

MR. DEGHETALDI: Right. And there is a pending investigation that was initiated by the CPUC in December of last year, following a report by the safety enforcement division of the CPUC. And I'm just going to read a little bit from the safety enforcement division's report, where their preliminary investigation demonstrated instances of falsification of safety records, certain leaders' knowledge about PG&E's falsification of safety records, the failure to eliminate practice of falsification, even though it was reported repeatedly since 2009, and instances of underreporting the number of violations of the excavation requirement internally and to the SED.

The Court will recall that in February of this year, there was an explosion on Geary. And fortunately, nobody was injured. Some buildings were damaged. But it took over an hour and a half for PG&E to turn off the gas that was shooting up in a towering flame. And that was forty-five minutes longer than it took them to turn off the gas after the San Bruno explosion.

A report in the Chronicle by PG&E representatives said that the reason that it took so long was that they had to excavate under the asphalt to reach five -- five valves to turn off the gas. Then late last month, Your Honor, the safety enforcement division issued a supplemental report that included the deposition of a PG&E auditor. And in that supplemental

- 1 report, they asked the CPUC to extend the investigation --
- MR. KAROTKIN: Excuse me, Your Honor, is this -- is he
- 3 testifying? Is this evidence? I mean, he's referring to
- 4 things that are -- we haven't seen, they're not in the record.
- 5 I don't understand. Is this like --
- 6 THE COURT: Yeah.
- 7 MR. KAROTKIN: -- is this attorney testifying?
- 8 THE COURT: Well, why don't you folk give me some
- 9 idea.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: I --
- 11 THE COURT: What is the purpose of this? I understand
- 12 about --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Your Honor --
- 14 THE COURT: I didn't read the detail but I know about
- 15 the explosion.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Your Honor --
- THE COURT: Therefore, what?
- 18 MR. DEGHETALDI: Your Honor, I am a stranger in a
- 19 strange land here. I'm just a tort lawyer.
- THE COURT: You're a very experienced, highly
- 21 respected lawyer.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: And I'm --
- THE COURT: You need to tell me what the relevance is
- 24 today.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: The relevance is, Your Honor, that

- 1 the -- that this company -- I've been dealing with them for ten
- 2 years.
- 3 THE COURT: I got it.
- 4 MR. DEGHETALDI: And --
- 5 THE COURT: What do I do?
- 6 MR. DEGHETALDI: -- and --
- 7 THE COURT: What do you want me to do now?
- 8 MR. DEGHETALDI: If -- I'm coming to the end of my
- 9 | little talk --
- 10 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: -- about records and recordkeeping
- 12 and trying to update what has been going on, just within the
- last few days and if the Court would give me latitude to do
- 14 | that --
- THE COURT: Well, I --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: -- I'll get to the point.
- 17 THE COURT: -- and I will but Mr. Julian covered a lot
- of territory and I don't mind a little bit of repetition but I
- 19 | am not --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: This is new.
- 21 THE COURT: I am not Judge Alsup. This is not a
- 22 | criminal proceeding or a probation. I have to figure out what
- 23 to do with the bankruptcy.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Understood.
- THE COURT: So that's what I want you to focus on.

- 1 MR. DEGHETALDI: Understood.
- THE COURT: Go ahead.
- 3 MR. DEGHETALDI: But I think that they're --
- 4 THE COURT: Go ahead. You got it.
- 5 MR. DEGHETALDI: There is an interrelationship between
- 6 | them that can't be avoided or ignored.
- 7 THE COURT: I know but I don't want testifying, just
- 8 | give me your pitch and I will do my best to listen to you --
- 9 MR. DEGHETALDI: Okay.
- 10 THE COURT: -- and consider what you're saying.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Your Honor, for counsel to say that
- 12 PG&E is not aware of what has been going on --
- THE COURT: No, he didn't say that.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: -- with the CPUC.
- THE COURT: He didn't say that. He's asking if you're
- 16 | testifying. I didn't -- wasn't offended by his interruption.
- 17 I am letting you go ahead. Go ahead.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

- MR. DEGHETALDI: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
- The recent report within the last few days where the
- 20 | SED asked the CPUC to extend their investigation to include the
- 21 located mark program for underground electrical utilities and
- 22 | the testimony of the PG&E employee, the auditor, said in her --
- 23 at page 49 of her deposition, that PG&E does not have any
- records of the location of the underground electrical system.
- 25 THE COURT: But isn't that for the PUC to deal with?

- 1 MR. DEGHETALDI: It is, Your Honor, but --
- THE COURT: Again, what I am supposed to do with the
- 3 incentive plan, say you can't pay your employees because you
- 4 don't keep underground records?
- 5 MR. DEGHETALDI: Here's the deal, Your Honor. Here's
- 6 the deal.
- 7 THE COURT: Go ahead.
- 8 MR. DEGHETALDI: Okay. PG&E is asking the Court to
- 9 approve a plan that pays quarterly incentive payments for the
- 10 first time in God knows how long, ahead of a serious
- 11 investigation by the CPUC, ahead of the performance under the
- new conditions of probation by PG&E, ahead of possible new
- conditions of probation that are to be imposed by Judge Alsup
- 14 and Your Honor, there is now a grand jury, a criminal grand
- 15 jury that is sitting in Butte County, investigating criminal
- actions, possible criminal actions, by PG&E and to allow PG&E
- 17 | to pay --
- 18 THE COURT: I approved a settlement with Butte County,
- 19 | is that --
- 20 MR. DEGHETALDI: This is --
- 21 THE COURT: -- different?
- MR. DEGHETALDI: That was for the North Bay fire --
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: -- Your Honor, this is for the
- 25 campfire.

THE COURT: But again, I will accept -- I'll take your representation that this is going on. I don't want to hear what the grand jury is doing.

MR. DEGHETALDI: Right.

5 THE COURT: I will take your word that there's an 6 investigation.

7 MR. DEGHETALDI: And I have no --

8 THE COURT: I got it.

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DEGHETALDI: -- I have no --

THE COURT: Okay. So look, there are a bunch of things that this company has to deal with and you've listed several of them and we know what obviously the major ones are. So again, your point, I take it, is that I shouldn't allow this incentive.

MR. DEGHETALDI: My point, Your Honor, is not that radical.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DEGHETALDI: My point is that the Court should not allow the incentive, any incentives to be paid on a quarterly basis and should not allow any incentives to be paid until the earliest, at the end of the year, that the Court should not allow any incentives to be paid without full disclosure of this plan.

24 THE COURT: Well, basically what Mr. Julian said.

MR. DEGHETALDI: Yes.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

- 2 MR. DEGHETALDI: Yes, Your Honor.
- 3 THE COURT: Again, I just want to --
- 4 MR. DEGHETALDI: And I am just --
- 5 THE COURT: That's okay, I got it.

MR. DEGHETALDI: And I do not believe that the Court should allow incentives to be paid without names and amounts, and amounts and rationales being disclosed to the public, not just to any particular committee or creditor.

THE COURT: What would be the utility of having lists of names and names and names and names of people that are again, just the rank and file people that are doing their jobs? So, Mr. X, who gets paid a base salary of 70,000 dollars might get five more thousand under the STIP. What do we accomplish by putting him in the public eye?

MR. DEGHETALDI: We accomplish possibly commendations that might come from the public to those sorts of individuals who do their job well and we recognize that there are a number of them, but it will also allow us to sort through the names of people who may be responsible for past acts or future acts, or past violations or future violations of the law, regulations or orders of the CPUC.

THE COURT: Well, come on. I don't understand that.

If I ordered the debtor to make available to you or to the committee or to the public, the list of employees who would be

- 1 under the STIP and you got a spreadsheet that said Joe Smith,
- 2 | salary 70,000, STIP 5,000, that doesn't -- I mean, what do you
- 3 | want me to do? Get the -- open his personnel file?
- 4 MR. DEGHETALDI: No.
- 5 THE COURT: I mean, but --
- 6 MR. DEGHETALDI: No.
- 7 THE COURT: -- that doesn't tell you or me or the
- 8 | public whether Mr. Smith is a good employee or a bad employee.
- 9 The STIP and the way it's been teed up to me is the managers
- 10 have a way of making sure that people that are not performing
- 11 can be excised out of it. Isn't that --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Your Honor?
- THE COURT: You're grinning but the plan says it.
- 14 Right?
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Your Honor, look, I'm grinning
- 16 | because I have a painful memory of taking Geisha Williams'
- deposition and asking her about the Butte fire.
- 18 THE COURT: But that's -- again --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: No, it's not, Your Honor.
- 20 THE COURT: No, I --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: It's not.
- THE COURT: I am going to cut you off. I asked you a
- 23 question about the rank and file and you're taking your issue
- 24 with the former CEO --
- MR. DEGHETALDI: No.

- THE COURT: -- and she is not on trial here today.
- 2 MR. DEGHETALDI: No, Your Honor. You said -- with
- 3 respect, you said the plan has provisions for a manager to say
- 4 that this --
- 5 THE COURT: Right.
- 6 MR. DEGHETALDI: -- person is --
- 7 THE COURT: Yes, that's right.
- 8 MR. DEGHETALDI: -- does your --
- 9 THE COURT: The manager can say this guy hasn't been
- 10 performing, doesn't get it.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: And I'm saying, Your Honor, that from
- my personal experience, that the management of PG&E has a habit
- of denying responsibility for actions that have led to death
- 14 and destruction across the State of California and I was using,
- was trying to use, the deposition of Geisha Williams that I
- 16 took where I asked her did PG&E do anything wrong with respect
- 17 to the Butte fire and she said no.
- 18 THE COURT: Okay. I understand. I appreciate it.
- 19 I -- that's helpful to clarify it that way.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: So that's all I have to say, Your
- 21 Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. DEGHETALDI: Thank you.
- THE COURT: Thank you.
- All right. Mr. Tredinnick and then Ms. Pino. And

- 1 then we'll take a break.
- MR. TREDINNICK: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. Edward
- 3 Tredinnick of Greene Radovsky on behalf of the City and County
- 4 of San Francisco.
- 5 The City supports the tort claimants' committee. We
- 6 | filed a joinder in their opposition.
- 7 THE COURT: Right, I read --
- 8 MR. TREDINNICK: I'll be just --
- 9 THE COURT: -- I got that.
- 10 MR. TREDINNICK: I'll be very brief, Your Honor. We
- 11 think that the incentives should be directed towards safety and
- 12 reliability, rather than financial performance and that the
- people who are receiving those incentives are performing the
- 14 safety and reliability functions.
- We agree with the U.S. Trustee that there should be
- 16 | some transparency as to who is receiving these, so that the --
- 17 essentially the people with the boots on the grounds are
- 18 getting these benefits and not the management. I think that
- 19 that should be included within this -- in the plan.
- I was glad to see that the creditors' committee has
- 21 obtained some additional metrics towards safety and I think
- 22 that that should be even done more so.
- THE COURT: Well, you're aware of the adjustment
- downward for financial and upward for safety, right? There's
- 25 only --

1 MR. TREDINNICK: I am aware of that, Your Honor, but

2 the --

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

3 THE COURT: I mean, there's only so much left.

4 MR. TREDINNICK: -- the --

5 THE COURT: There's only so much --

6 MR. TREDINNICK: Yeah.

7 THE COURT: -- to go around. So, I mean, Mr.

Tredinnick, I think that all I could do is tell them to do away with financial or customer relations or -- I think that's all that -- there are just three categories, aren't there?

MR. TREDINNICK: Right. Well, Your Honor, I think that that would be consistent with what Judge Alsup had ruled in denying any dividends until the safety plan is put into effect.

THE COURT: I would like to know how the company would be paying dividends anyway. It's in bankruptcy, so without taking issue with Judge Alsup, I am not sure that paying dividends while you're in bankruptcy is an option that anybody had in the first place but maybe somebody was thinking about it and Judge Alsup has taken that away but that's not the point.

21 Okay. I got your message.

MR. TREDINNICK: I don't want to belabor these points because I think my predecessors have pretty much hit everything that we were interested in.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. TREDINNICK: And we'll just -- I'll conclude 2 there.

3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Pino, you're the closer here for the morning session -- pre-break session.

MS. PINO: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate that -- the opportunity to address the Court.

Your Honor, the Ghost Ship plaintiff fully support the positions taken by the United States trustee and by the tort committee. Mr. Julian's reading into the record of the email by CEO Simon is particularly illustrative. He said this is a very significant admission and it is an admission. Nothing is business as usual for a fire victim, whether they be the Ghost Ship fire or the wildfires, nothing should be business as usual for PG&E.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MS. PINO: That's all, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Pino.

All right. I am going to take a fifteen-minute break for everyone's personal convenience. I'll say the persons on the phone can either hang on the phone or recall through CourtCall, I will let you take care of that. For everyone in the courtroom, I will resume at 11:30 and at that point, I will ask for the debtor's representatives and the Local 20 and if they actually -- I didn't mean to exclude the un -- excuse

me -- the unsecured creditors' committee, if its counsel wants
to be heard, I will hear from him and then I'll see if anyone
else wishes to be heard.

So Mr. Karotkin, I don't have a sequence, if you want to speak first or let the others go, it's up to you or whoever is going to speak. You guys work that out. I will see you in fifteen minutes.

(Recess from 11:14 a.m., until 11:42 a.m.)

9 THE CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: Remain seated. Sorry about the delay. I didn't get the message to come back in. It's my fault. All right.

What is the debtors' pleasure, Mr. Karotkin? All right. Committee first?

MR. BRAY: Yes, sir. Good -- good morning, Your

Honor -- close -- Gregory Bray, Milbank LLP, counsel for the unsecured creditors' committee.

Your Honor, I want to start by addressing the question you asked in part of your discussion today, which is will this STIP help facilitate the restructuring of this company? That's the very question that the committee asked its advisors, Milbank and FTI, when the motion was filed and we were tasked with taking a position on it, and the answer was, we concluded, yes, it will.

Why is that? Well, the employees are an integral part

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

of this company and its restructuring. A healthy, robust, satisfied, incentivized employee base is only going to ensure, help ensure, the company is best in class and safety, will perform well in terms of financial metrics. The company can't do these things without the proper employee base.

So it became clear to the committee, at least, that the question of do we need to incentivize the employees or should we be compensating them in this manner to assist and facilitate in the restructuring, the answer was yes.

If you look at the peer groups for this industry and this company, they have similar structures. Our safety metric is much higher than theirs are, if the Court approves the stipulation but it is a common tool used to incentivize employees. And as I've said, the employees are critical to the success in the restructuring of the company.

It's the same analysis that we employed, Your Honor, when we stood before you and asked you to approve the DIP. The company is stabilized by the employee base. Stabilization preserves, if not enhances value. That value is used to pay creditors claims, preferably in full, as you've heard other parties say, is their desire. So this is one of the early predicates to laying the foundation to the restructuring.

Having said that, the question for the committee was what are the proper metrics for the STIP? And as the Court has been advised, the committee concluded that the debtor was on

the right track but there needed to be some tweaks, to use someone else's words.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

And the committee is committed to having this company exit as a best in class in terms of safety and you've heard lots of reasons why that's important. The committee agrees with all of them but there are additional reasons. Our committee, Your Honor, is the vendors, the suppliers, such as the tree trimmers, the employees, the pensioneers, the holders of the counterparties to PPAs, the holders of the long-term debt.

These claims exceed, in their current form, 20 billion dollars and if you factor in the exposure on executory contracts, could be double that. So it's a very significant number.

Not only that, these are the types of creditors who will help form the backbone of this company when it exits bankruptcy. Their support will be critical to the company, so it's equally critical to our constituency that the company have a best in class safety program. And our conclusion was that the metrics should be adjusted to reflect that upward and we have that negotiation with the debtor. Our financial advisor, FTI, was tasked with negotiating with the company on this, looking at the metrics, trying to assess as best they could, what appropriate adjustments should be there and you've seen them: an upward adjustment in safety, a downward adjustment in

financial performance, and then essentially equivalents in terms of customer service, which I don't want to discount by any circumstance.

So where we arrived was is it perfect? Of course not. I mean, nothing ever is, but on balance, the committee believes that this is a STIP that makes sense for this company. It addresses the needs of the company. It addresses the concerns with respect to safety and it will facilitate the company's restructuring and exit from bankruptcy as soon as possible.

So for those reasons, we support the STIP, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bray.

Yes, sir?

2.1

MR. BOTTER: Good morning, Your Honor. David Botter,
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, on behalf of the ad hoc
committee of senior unsecured noteholders.

Your Honor, we filed a 2019 earlier in these cases, showing that our collective holdings in utility debt are almost nine billion dollars. Your Honor made an important point earlier today that, in fact, we are in bankruptcy, and in Chapter 11, the duty of the debtors and the official committees is to maximum value.

Your Honor, we think that this motion directed towards the rank and file does just that. It maximizes values for these estates. With the unsecured creditors' committee's changes, we're supportive of the entry of the order approving

the motion. We believe the changes appropriately balance the need to increase the focus on safety for all and on prevention of wildfires with the duty to maximize value.

And with that, Your Honor, we think that with the committee's changes, the order should be entered.

THE COURT: What, in your mind, does maximize value mean? I mean it's a label but it does have a tangible impact on the other side of the room --

MR. BOTTER: Your Honor?

THE COURT: - the tort victims.

MR. BOTTER: Your Honor, the rank and file of these companies, it's their duty to keep the lights on.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BOTTER: I know it's a bad pun but that is really what is, in fact, they're going to be doing here, and without the people who are on the lines, who are charged with keeping the power on, who are charged with cutting trees down, who are charged with continued focus on safety, yes, Your Honor, we've heard a lot about potential bad actors and I'm certain that the company is attempting to weed out any potential bad actors but the people who are doing the job, and who are necessary to decrease the risks associated with what has happened in the past, should be paid.

And we think that maximizing value, not only for the financial creditors because that's who we represent, but for

- 1 all creditors, including the victims of the wildfires, is what
- 2 these people will do and this is why we are in support of this
- 3 motion.
- 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- 5 MR. BOTTER: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: Anyone else besides the debtor?
- 7 All right. Yes, ma'am?
- 8 Good afternoon -- or morning still.
- 9 MS. GRAY: Good morning, Your Honor. Caitlin Gray,
- 10 Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld, appearing for ESC Local 20.
- 11 You asked at the beginning of the hearing today, and I
- think the answer is, yes, the employees represented by ESC
- 13 Local 20 are in a different category here than the rest of the
- 14 employees.
- 15 THE COURT: Well, 20 -- some of them.
- MS. GRAY: I'm sorry?
- 17 THE COURT: Some of them. I mean, because some of
- 18 them are not included in the STIP, right?
- MS. GRAY: That's correct.
- THE COURT: Yeah, okay.
- MS. GRAY: There's about 1,400 employees that are
- 22 included in the STIP and represented by ESC Local 20.
- We're not taking a position on nonrepresented
- 24 employees, including managers, higher-level employees,
- 25 potential insiders, former LTIP recipients who have gotten

1 lumped into the STIP now. We're only talking about the 2 employees represented by the union, which are the rank-and-file 3 employees doing the important work to maintain and modernize 4 the utility. And there is no evidence that any of them have 5 done anything wrong, which is substantiated in this very 6 declaration. These are not the supervisors who have been 7 accused of misstating reports. These are just the working 8 people who are keeping the utility running and doing the work 9 to modernize it and make it safer.

And they are in a different category than the other employees in the STIP because these payments are part of the compensation required in their collective bargaining agreement. Their collective bargaining agreement, which is Berry Declaration Exhibit A, provides that the eligible employees will receive STIP payments according to the formula laid out in the collective bargaining agreement. And they gave up --

THE COURT: But I didn't and couldn't comprehend the collective bargaining agreement. It's not in any particular STIP, is it? In other words, it's not the particular STIP that's the subject of this motion? It's whatever --

MS. GRAY: No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 THE COURT: -- the STIP is --

MS. GRAY: No, no.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

24 THE COURT: -- right?

25 MS. GRAY: The STIP that is in the collective

4 MS. GRAY: -- is a different formula that the employees have since negotiated with PG&E to modify.

THE COURT: Um-hum.

Section 1113 protects wages and benefits in a collective bargaining agreement and says they can't be modified --

9 THE COURT: Yeah, right.

MS. GRAY: -- unless the debtors go through this specific process. Well, the debtors did negotiate with the union about changing the STIP program, making various changes, moving away from an annual payment to quarterly payments, changing the way the individual performance modifier is implemented. And the union agreed to the plan before you with the modifications required by the UCC.

THE COURT: Well, what is the impact -- again, because this wasn't really teed up as an issue -- kind of a subissue --

MS. GRAY: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- until I read your joinder. What if I said -- and I was persuaded by the tort victims and their arguments, said I simply -- I can't approve the STIP. What happens to your clients, your 1,400 people who are parties to the agreement? I mean, they're not --

- 1 MS. GRAY: So the --
- THE COURT: The debtor isn't moving to reject it --
- 3 | the agreement. The terms and conditions still apply, don't
- 4 they?
- 5 MS. GRAY: Yeah. And there is a pending grievance
- 6 about the failure to pay the 2018 payments.
- 7 THE COURT: Let me rephrase my question. In the last
- 8 | forty-eight hours or twenty-four hours, the debtor and the
- 9 official unsecured creditors' committee negotiated amendments
- 10 to the STIP. That doesn't impact the collective bargaining
- 11 agreement, does it?
- MS. GRAY: Well, so the UCC does not actually
- represent the employees --
- 14 THE COURT: Right, no.
- MS. GRAY: -- that are represented by the union.
- 16 THE COURT: No, I understand. I understand.
- MS. GRAY: And so our position is that the debtor
- 18 | can't implement those changes unless --
- 19 THE COURT: No, but maybe I'm not phrasing the
- 20 question well.
- MS. GRAY: So PG&E brought the changes that the UCC
- demanded to the union and negotiated with the union to get the
- 23 union's approval of the new STIP program with the modifications
- 24 presented --
- THE COURT: In the last two days?

1 MS. GRAY: Starting on Friday and, yeah, on Monday,
2 yes.

3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So -- all right.

Now what happens? What happens to your clients,

again, the ones who are covered -- not to ignore the ones who

aren't covered, but --

7 MS. GRAY: Um-hum.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

8 THE COURT: -- they're not covered -- if I disapprove 9 this agreement?

MS. GRAY: So this agreement is --

THE COURT: If I disapprove it across the board, I think then, clearly, that's a problem. If I send it back for tweaking, or renegotiating, or something, then I guess is it correct that your clients will have to decide whether they want to adjust further or allege that there's been a grievance.

MS. GRAY: A breach.

THE COURT: Or I mean -- that's the wrong word. You know what I mean.

MS. GRAY: Right.

THE COURT: Initiate a grievance.

MS. GRAY: Right. So the plan that's before you today is contingent upon Bankruptcy Court approval. And so if you don't approve it, the negotiated package falls through, and we're left with the collective bargaining agreement. And yes, the union would claim that the collective bargaining agreement

1 | would be breached. And we --

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, yes. Yes, but --

MS. GRAY: And we would argue that it would be entitled to administrative status because it's a current

5 contract that hasn't been modified or rejected.

told, if you want a STIP approved, you're going to have to change it, then the debtor will have to decide, vis-a-vis ESP (sic) 20, whether it's willing to go along with changes. And if they're not, then what happens happens, right?

THE COURT: Well, or alternatively, if the debtor is

And it's not -- it doesn't mean the debtor files an 1113 motion. It doesn't mean anything except --

MS. GRAY: Well --

THE COURT: -- that the parties have to be --

15 MS. GRAY: -- absent an 1113 motion --

16 THE COURT: Right.

MS. GRAY: -- the debtor is bound to honor what's in the contract, which does provide that a STIP will be paid according to the formula laid out in the contract.

THE COURT: Yeah. But again, what if I don't approve it? Is that a breach of the collective bargaining agreement?

MS. GRAY: So this modified version, if the Court doesn't approve it and the debtor fails to pay what's required by the collective bargaining agreement, which does not require Court approval, then yes, the debtor will be in breach. And we

argue that the damages from that breach will be entitled to administrative status as contractually required wages and benefits.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, if I decide to approve it, it's academic. If I decide to disapprove it across the board, then I guess that means that the debtor and your client will have to decide what they do next.

And if I tell the debtor, go back to the drawing board and do better, same thing. I mean, your client will either go along with it or not go along with it, right? I mean, those are the only two choices, aren't they?

MS. GRAY: Yes.

THE COURT: I mean, I'm not negotiating with you. As I say, the whole thing of the STIP didn't -- there was no collective bargaining 1113 issue until you filed your joinder. And again, I'm glad you did, but I didn't know what I'm supposed to do with it and the debtors' reply didn't say anything about it, so here we are.

MS. GRAY: I do think that the other -- because we are dealing with a smaller portion of employees -- only 1,400 employees --

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MS. GRAY: -- and because this is part of their contractual compensation -- again, they gave up base wages in order to get these STIP payments in their contract. And so

it's a really important part of their compensation. It's not a
bonus; it's not an increase in their wages; it's not incentives
related to bankruptcy. This is part of their pay that they
rely on, on an annual basis, to meet their cost of living.

And because it's in the collective bargaining agreement and it is negotiated between the union and the company, it does have a special status afforded to it by Section 1113. And so we would ask that the Court grant the motion, at least with respect to employees represented by ESC Local 20.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that I have the flexibility, but I suppose if I tell the debtor, you're going to have to do better across the board, they can always decide whether they want to carve out ESP (sic) 20 from the STIP and have a little separate STIP. Again, I'm not going to try to pretend to know what the labor law ramifications are.

At the moment, the debtor hasn't asked to do that.

The debtors have asked to have Court approval of the STIP, as now modified. And you've clarified your position. And that's helpful. Okay.

- MS. GRAY: All right.
- THE COURT: Thanks very much.
- MS. GRAY: Thank you.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 24 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Karotkin?
- So a first question, because this isn't something that

was discussed Mr. Julian or the U.S. Trustee or anybody else.

And it was kind of -- I gave you a little bit of a clue when I asked you about board approval. Among all the other things that are highly publicized is the significant change in the board. And I don't even know when the effective date of that

is. But at least, according to the press, the new CEO and the new board will be in office sometime soon.

MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It seems to me, at the very minimum, I should say let's see if the new board and the new CEO have the same view as the prior management.

I mean, it's a broad question, and it's -- you might tell me it's not part of the business judgment, but I'm the one that has to approve this thing. So what's wrong with -- whether I insist that there be disclosure, as the U.S. Trustee asks, or participate in some sort of negotiated explanation of the metrics as Mr. Julian and the others argued, why don't I just say, wait a minute, this was negotiated by the prior watch; things have changed dramatically. How many times have we talked about this case as different? Well, one of the things that's different is there's been a major board change and a major CEO change.

So why don't I say, let's go see if the CEO is prepared to tell me that this is a good thing for the reorganization effort and for the goals of protecting the

- 1 | creditors, including the wildfire victims?
- MR. KAROTKIN: I think, Your Honor, there is actually
- 3 | a very easy answer to this. This is not something unusual.
- 4 This is a customary program that's been in place for thirty
- 5 years.
- 6 THE COURT: I know, but you were --
- 7 MR. KAROTKIN: It's been tweaked.
- 8 THE COURT: -- you were here in the room. It's
- 9 unusual because of what's happened with the company, and the
- 10 fires, and what's the real world.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Well, Your Honor, actually, I disagree
- 12 with that.
- 13 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KAROTKIN: I don't think it's unusual because of
- 15 | that. I think that as the creditors' committee and Mr.
- Botter's client recognize, this is something that is necessary
- 17 to incentivize 10,000 of the employee base to achieve the
- 18 | company metrics. Now, sixty-five percent safety, they've been
- 19 increased. And it's critical to the ongoing operation and to
- 20 | achieve the company's wildfire mitigation plan.
- 21 And Your Honor, we're not asking for something at all
- 22 unusual. As you yourself recognize, this plan effectively is a
- continuation of what the company generally did, with a few
- 24 changes. We acknowledge quarterly payments. But again, it
- 25 merely picks up the traditional types of awards under the prior

plans, the same type of discretionary judgment that the board
has. Again, the new board always has the option to say, going
forward, don't make any quarterly payment and don't make the
annual payment for any reason, whether individual or otherwise.
Again, this is not something that, other than the compensation
committee, that the board would necessarily get involved with.

THE COURT: Well -- but again, why are you pretending this case is the same as all the other ones? It isn't, in part --

MR. KAROTKIN: I agree.

THE COURT: -- in part, because the last time I had the PG&E case -- and every other bankruptcy case I've been involved with, except a couple that have had torts -- they haven't had a major constituency of creditors who are victims, who didn't choose to be creditors. So why don't I have to treat it a little differently?

MR. KAROTKIN: I think you can acknowledge, as we do, Your Honor, the fact that there are tort claimants here. But I don't think that has anything to do with the fact that what is being contemplated here is something prospectively for the good of the business and in order to maximize value, preserve the value, incentivize the employees to achieve the goals of the company, which again, now are safety, performance --

THE COURT: Um-hum.

MR. KAROTKIN: -- and customer satisfaction. That

doesn't change based on the creditor constituency.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

I think -- what we've indicated in our papers, Your Honor, is that this isn't an issue for the tort claimants or the other claimants of what's appropriate moving forward. This is an issue. And what they focus on, Your Honor, is what happened in the past and why should we give people what they claim to be bonuses for something that happened in the past.

And what we say, Your Honor, that's irrelevant. This is not an issue of retribution. This is not an issue of punishment. This is an issue of what is appropriate, under the business judgement of the management and the board, to motivate the employees to increase the value and to achieve the safety metrics that are part of this plan and critical to this plan. It's prospective. We acknowledge that there were fires in 2017 and 2018. But this company has a business to operate. And critical to the operation of that business is providing certainty and the ability to its employees to achieve a competitive rate of compensation, the opportunity to do that.

As I said, again, in the papers, Your Honor, to the extent that the tort committee and the other objectors wanted to extract a pound of flesh or thought that was appropriate, that's been done. The company withdrew the 2018 STIP plan. It's been done. And as a result of that, they're focused now on moving forward, as Mr. Simon, by the way, indicated in his email. They are focused on moving forward and to make sure

that the employee base is aligned with the company going
forward.

And as you said, you can't prevent things from happening. But if you don't have an employee base aligned and motivated, bad things will happen. And we think important from the standpoint of the entire creditor body, Your Honor, to provide the appropriate incentives to enable them that if they do their jobs, if they achieve the performance metrics, again, subject to the discretion whether it's quarterly or annually, for the board in its total discretion to modify those payments --

THE COURT: Well, I know.

MR. KAROTKIN: And if --

THE COURT: But in its discretion. We know it's in its discretion. And it would -- probably wouldn't have to come back and ask me for permission to exercise its discretion not to make the payment. I think I'm kind of on Mr. Julian's side in the sense here that if the minimum -- I mean, if the maximum -- minimum becomes a maximum or maximum becomes a minimum, 350 million dollars is on the budget. It's hard for me to imagine that is not likely to happen.

The question is what is the impact on the company's ability to get out of bankruptcy. And I realize -- I said this is not a confirmation hearing. I'm not asking you to prove that you've got a feasible Chapter 11 plan here. But I got to

- 1 have a sense that everything you say is supportable long term.
- 2 And that's, again, the problem I'm having. It's not -- I'm not
- 3 opposed to it. And you know what, the United States Trustee
- 4 and Mr. Julian aren't opposed to a plan. It's this plan.
- 5 MR. KAROTKIN: Well, let me address a couple of things
- 6 you mentioned.
- 7 THE COURT: Yes.
- 8 MR. KAROTKIN: First of all, find this on the
- 9 demonstrative, the company has never, ever, ever paid out at
- 10 maximum. Never in the history of the company has it paid out
- 11 at maximum.
- 12 THE COURT: Do we know what the maximum has ever been?
- MR. KAROTKIN: The maximum has always been sort of
- 14 consistent with the past.
- THE COURT: Well, okay.
- MR. KAROTKIN: In fact, Your Honor, it was higher.
- 17 There was an ability in prior years to achieve a higher amount
- of compensation because -- at the top level of performance,
- 19 they could achieve 200 percent of their target bonus. That's
- 20 been reduced to 150 percent.
- 21 THE COURT: No, I understand.
- 22 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. And what the tort committee
- 23 | would have you believe by looking at these charts is that there
- 24 is a big discrepancy as to what's available. And I think you
- 25 put your finger on it when you said this doesn't take into

- 1 | account the LTIP portion.
- THE COURT: Well, Mr. Julian acknowledged that that
- 3 might be about a 70-million-dollar bogey there, right?
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: It is. And you compare it to 2018 at
- 5 target, including the LTIP with the 2019 STIP plan which
- 6 includes fifty percent of the LTIP, the numbers are precisely
- 7 the same, at target 235 million dollars. And I think we've
- 8 noted that in our papers.
- 9 THE COURT: But again, I hate to sound cynical, but
- 10 I'm going to be cynical. What you're telling me, bottom line,
- 11 is instead of paying equity to some people, we're going to pay
- 12 them more money. And despite Mr. Simon's letter of two months
- earlier, we're going to double the amount of money that we're
- 14 going to commit under this plan. How do I -- that's not a bad
- deal. I mean, that's like who would -- who would have not
- 16 turned down the 2018 plan if the 2019 plan is on the table?
- MR. KAROTKIN: It's not double. I don't, frankly,
- 18 understand where that's coming from.
- 19 THE COURT: Well, I'm just looking at --
- MR. KAROTKIN: Under --
- 21 THE COURT: I -- well, I --
- MR. KAROTKIN: At target, it's precisely the same
- dollars. At target, it's 234 million for 2018, including the
- LTIP. And at target, the STIP is 234 million, including the
- 25 LTIP.

- 1 THE COURT: Okay.
- 2 MR. KAROTKIN: It hasn't increased materially.
- 3 THE COURT: But you said the company has never hit the
- 4 max.
- 5 MR. KAROTKIN: That's at target. I'm not talking
- 6 about the max. The company has never hit the max.
- 7 THE COURT: Okay.
- 8 MR. KAROTKIN: So I think to look at --
- 9 THE COURT: I understand.
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- the max --
- 11 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- is misleading.
- THE COURT: No. But I -- okay. But I'm asking you
- 14 | what if I said tell me what the -- as the highest it's ever
- 15 been in the max column. In other words, to state it
- differently, if I'm looking at Mr. Julian's chart and I see 350
- million dollars at max and I accept that that includes the
- 18 LTIP, now tell me what is the highest it ever could have been
- 19 | if I take those two facts together historically. And if you
- 20 | tell me, well, at ninety-nine percent, I won't be very
- 21 persuaded. But if you told me it's never been over sixty
- 22 percent or something, then I might say, well, let's just take
- 23 | it a different way. I don't know. I don't know what's the
- 24 right thing to.
- But in other words, I announced today all the times I

- 1 | wish I had a crystal ball. So I'll have another crystal ball.
- 2 My crystal ball is that you can tell me what the maximum will
- 3 ever be paid under the 2019 STIP and you can't. But what if I
- 4 told you it can't be more than some figure? What would happen?
- 5 MR. KAROTKIN: Your Honor, you're right. I can't tell
- 6 you -- all I can tell you, the maximum will not be more than
- 7 350 million dollars.
- 8 THE COURT: Right, I know.
- 9 MR. KAROTKIN: That I can tell you. Okay?
- 10 THE COURT: Yeah.
- MR. KAROTKIN: And depending on performance and how
- 12 the targets are achieved and the metrics work, yes, if there is
- 13 phenomenal performance, absolutely phenomenal performance.
- 14 Again, it's never been done. Beyond the wildest imagination
- 15 then the 350 million dollars will be paid. I think it's fair
- 16 to say that based on historical application of the STIP and how
- 17 | the metrics have been allocated and determined, that has never
- 18 happened. So I think the risk of that is extremely remote.
- 19 THE COURT: But one way to make sure it's not only
- 20 extremely remote, that it can happen, is I can just say there's
- 21 | qot a to be a cap.

Case: 19-30088

- MR. KAROTKIN: You can say that.
- THE COURT: In other words, 350- is too high.
- MR. KAROTKIN: And --
- THE COURT: The cap has to be some other number.

MR. KAROTKIN: You can say that. And if, Your Honor, in your judgment you believe that that was an appropriate way to motivate the employees, you could make that judgment and you could substitute that judgment for the judgment of management that runs this company.

But I think, Your Honor, under the applicable law, under the applicable law which you yourself recognize which is the business judgment rule, deference is given to the business judgment of management which makes these decisions as the input of outside advisors to help it make those decision and is responsible, Your Honor, for the day-to-day operation of the company.

And I will say, Your Honor, under the applicable case law which I believe we cited in our pleadings --

THE COURT: You did.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325 Filed: 04/10/19

MR. KAROTKIN: -- particularly with respect to compensation matters, that fundamentally is within the business judgment of management, fundamentally.

THE COURT: Well, I know that. And I expected you to say that. And I don't know you very well, but people that have seen me on this job for a long time now I think probably, I predict, would say that I generally refer to the business judgment. I don't second-guess it because I don't have the qualifications.

But you know what? I'm the only one to make the

- decision here. And so if I said to all those 10,000 people
- 2 | would you like a lower STIP or no STIP, I think I know what
- 3 they'd pick.
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: I think, Your Honor there's no question
- 5 you could do that.
- 6 THE COURT: I don't want to do that.
- 7 MR. KAROTKIN: But the question is, is that the right
- 8 decision?
- 9 THE COURT: Yeah.
- 10 MR. KAROTKIN: And, again, not to be disrespectful in
- 11 any respect --
- 12 THE COURT: You're not.
- MR. KAROTKIN: But again, these people who made these
- decisions are responsible for operations.
- THE COURT: But listen. You heard me say, you heard
- Mr. Julian say, you heard Mr. Laffredi say some of us don't
- 17 have a clue what we really are seeing. So I read the experts.
- 18 I read the chart. And I go what does that mean. And no one
- 19 has told me what it means except today --
- MR. KAROTKIN: Well, let me try --
- 21 THE COURT: -- in the argument.
- 22 MR. KAROTKIN: -- to address that. Let me try to
- 23 address that. Mr. Julian stood up before you and said --
- essentially said that he lacked information and wasn't given
- 25 information. Let me respond to that because every single piece

of information requested by the tort committee was provided in addition to the fact, as you know, we made the declarants available for deposition.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

So let's be totally clear about that. As to Mr. Laffredi, I think he answered the question for you when you said to him, well, did you ask for documents, did you participate in the deposition and he said no. And we went to Mr. Laffredi and his -- one of his colleagues when they asked for information and we said to them, again, consistent with what you were asking, Your Honor, would you be willing to accept the employee information, employee salary information, employee duties on a confidential basis. And they said no. And that was that.

Now, contrast that, Your Honor, with what the unsecured creditors' committee did with FTI, their financial advisors, to describe their interaction with AlixPartners, our financial advisors. To quote what Mr. Boken just told me a few minutes ago, they were crawling all over us, asking for information. And that information was supplied to them. And that information resulted in the decision where they agreed, subject to certain modifications, that the STIP would be modified.

As to the tort committee, not one communication from their financial advisor asking for information. Not one.

25 THE COURT: But I'm not --

1 MR. KAROTKIN: No. Let me just mention one more --2 I'm not allowed to ask the information. 3 I'm supposed to read these papers and understand them. And I 4 don't have an advanced degree in employee compensation matters. 5 And I read theses matrices and targets. And I don't know what 6 they mean. 7 MR. KAROTKIN: Well, let me try to address that as 8 well. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. Because, again, they're 11 consistent with prior years, with certain changes to the 12 metrics to, again, address safety --13 THE COURT: Right. 14 MR. KAROTKIN: -- and electric operations and to 15 increase that to sixty-five percent. And, moreover, Your 16 Honor, the STIP metrics as to those particular factors are 17 consistent with the company's 2019 wildfire mitigation plan 18 which was filed with the CPUC. Clearly, under those 19 circumstances, not a layup by any stretch of the imagination. 20 And they keep referring to Judge Alsup and what Judge 21 Alsup did. Well, if you look at the order they presented to 22 you, what he did on April 3rd was he agreed with our 2019 23 wildfire mitigation plan. And he said we should continue to 24 follow it. That's what he said. He didn't say change it.

only additional thing he said, Your Honor -- and again, it's

25

- 1 clear in there -- is that fi the CPUC, after it completes its
- 2 review of the 2019 wildfire mitigation plan, says that certain
- 3 modifications should be made, then we're required to make those
- 4 modifications.
- 5 THE COURT: Right. And I see that.
- 6 MR. KAROTKIN: And consistent with that -- and I think
- 7 even before Judge Alsup issued that order, we agreed with the
- 8 unsecured creditors' committee exactly to the same thing.
- 9 THE COURT: What happens if the company fails and a
- 10 lot of money goes out to people and Judge Alsup is told by the
- 11 CPUC or someone else they blew it? So more --
- MR. KAROTKIN: If the --
- THE COURT: -- more probation, more fines, but no
- 14 rollback, no clawback, right?
- MR. KAROTKIN: If the company fails again --
- THE COURT: Well, what I'm saying is if the company
- 17 | violates Judge Alsup's paragraph 2.
- MR. KAROTKIN: First of all, the company is not
- 19 proposing a plan it can't comply with, okay? That doesn't make
- 20 any sense. Okay?
- 21 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KAROTKIN: So yes, we agree, Your Honor. If
- 23 | something happens -- if there's another fire in November, we
- can't claw back those payments. We agree with that.
- 25 THE COURT: Right.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. But that's a balancing factor.

That's a balancing factor as to what's appropriate to provide in the STIP. And again, that was discussed at length among the compensation committee. That was discussed with Willis Towers Watson who, by the way, recommended the quarterly payments because that's what typically happens in a Chapter 11 case.

And that's a balancing as to what's appropriate.

Yes, it's possible that there could be payments made, maybe two payments because wildfire season starts in the summer, maybe only two payments. And then we can address the third payment and the fourth payment. And they can be eliminated entirely. And there are other ways to address those issues as well.

But, again, to deny these employees -- we're not talking about the senior people. We're talking about the people who operate this business, the people who make sure operations go forward, that appropriate safety measures are implemented and take place. To deny these people the opportunity, the opportunity, customary opportunity to realize competitive compensation is just not appropriate. And it's not going to maximize value and, in fact, will be detrimental and prejudicial not only to the wildfire claimants but to all other stakeholders in these cases.

And it's not going to facilitate, Your Honor, a reorganization here. In fact, it'll have exactly the opposite

- 1 effect. And --
- THE COURT: Well, we don't know that. I mean, we
- 3 don't know that.
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: I can assure you, Your Honor, if these
- 5 | 10,000 employees are not afforded the opportunity to get
- 6 | competitive market-based compensation, there will be exodus of
- 7 people -- there's a lot of uncertainty right now at the
- 8 company, a lot of instability in the workforce.
- 9 THE COURT: I'm sure that's true.
- 10 MR. KAROTKIN: And that is something that, again, this
- 11 management believes it's exceedingly important to address and
- 12 to stabilize the workforce. There is an expectation among the
- employee group that they are entitled to customary
- compensation. That was taken away from them in 2018, Your
- 15 Honor. But now we're moving forward. We're moving forward.
- We're trying to maximize value to expedite this company's
- 17 | emergence from Chapter 11 on a successful basis and to maximize
- 18 the recovery for creditors.
- And we submit to you, Your Honor, that not approving
- 20 this plan is not going to increase the pie for the wildfire
- 21 claimants, for the other claimants. In fact, as I said, it
- 22 | will have quite the opposite effect.
- THE COURT: Well, Mr. -- no, I understand. Mr. Simon
- wrote his letter to the employees on February 22nd of this
- 25 | vear. So 2018 was behind. And that's when he said what Mr.

- Julian quoted, we're not going to put ourselves at the front of the line. But then how many weeks later did the STIP motion get filed, four weeks later? I mean -- or whatever. The
 - I mean, I guess what I'm saying is when you're working on the line and you get a letter from the CEO that says you're not getting this money because -- and then four or five weeks later, your lawyers file a thing that pays what appears to be potentially more, it's like why is that such a bad thing. In other words, I guess what I'm missing here is maybe you're -- I'm missing that some people are missing their pay for 2018, but they are going to get paid under your proposal right well into 2019, right?
- MR. KAROTKIN: At a customary level.
- 15 THE COURT: At a customary level.

actual filing date isn't important.

- MR. KAROTKIN: This is not a -- this is not -- what
 you're sort of inferring, Your Honor, is that this 2019 STIP is
 a way to recoup what you didn't get in 2018.
- THE COURT: No. I don't know. I'm --
- MR. KAROTKIN: And it's not.
- 21 THE COURT: I'm trying to read the letter from the
- 22 boss.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. But what the --
- THE COURT: The boss says we can't put ourselves ahead
- 25 of the victims.

1 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. But again, Your Honor, the 2018 2 STIP payment was a pre-petition claim.

3 THE COURT: The letter was written post-petition.

4 MR. KAROTKIN: It's still a pre-petition claim.

THE COURT: But what would have happened if he hadn't

-- what would have happened if post-petition Mr. Simon hadn't

taken this position?

8 MR. KAROTKIN: We wouldn't have paid it because we -9 in order to pay it --

THE COURT: Would they have a claim? It would be a claim then.

MR. KAROTKIN: It would be a claim.

THE COURT: The claim. So --

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. KAROTKIN: Just like the wildfire claim inside of a claim, it would be a claim that -- a pre-petition claim that the employees would have just like that. There was no ability to pay that claim without court approval.

THE COURT: Well, they might have -- you might have asked. But the point is take -- I'll take that as a true statement, that when the chairman of the -- or the chief executive officer tells the employees you're not going to be paid, he might have also said and we can't pay you anyway. But he didn't.

MR. KAROTKIN: Everybody knew, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yeah.

- 1 MR. KAROTKIN: -- that there was a motion pending with 2 the Court --
- 3 THE COURT: Right.
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: -- to seek authority to pay that.
- 5 THE COURT: Yeah, that's right.
- 6 MR. KAROTKIN: It was no mystery.
- 7 THE COURT: You're correct.
- 8 MR. KAROTKIN: And that was withdrawn, okay? So there
 9 was no misconception, Your Honor, that that was going to be
 10 paid --
- 11 THE COURT: I didn't go back and look at -- the one
 12 thing you don't do when you're trying to manage these cases is
 13 read stuff you don't have to read. So I didn't remember if
 14 that motion that was withdrawn was couched in in a term in a
 15 way of paying post-petition and pre-petition liability. Is
 16 that the way it was read?
- MR. KAROTKIN: Yes. That's what it -- well, otherwise, we wouldn't have come to the court.
- THE COURT: Well, yeah, I understand. Okay. That's true.
- MR. KAROTKIN: And again, this is not a way to recoup
 what wasn't paid in 2018. This is a customary plan with better
 metrics.
- And, Your Honor, you mentioned earlier when there was some discussion about insiders -- you said something like,

- 1 | well, we could just pay a gift if we wanted to pay a gift
- 2 because it's not insiders. This is better than that. This is
- 3 like a KERP on steroids. Okay? This is an incentive-based
- 4 plan for rank and filed employees. It's not a KERP. It's much
- 5 better than a KERP.
- 6 Mr. Laffredi said it's a layup. Why isn't it a layup?
- 7 MR. KAROTKIN: Because, as I said, Your Honor, this --
- 8 these metrics are premised on the 2019 wildfire plan that the
- 9 debtors filed with the CPUC and that, again, as I mentioned
- 10 before, Judge Alsup said --
- 11 THE COURT: Yeah, I got it.
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- yes, continue with that.
- THE COURT: But again --
- MR. KAROTKIN: It can't be a layup --
- 15 THE COURT: I got to --
- 16 MR. KAROTKIN: -- under those circumstances.
- 17 THE COURT: I got to remind you of what I tried to say
- 18 | earlier. This is all nice to hear. I don't know how I
- 19 possibly know all this until I come to this hearing.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. But, Your Honor --
- THE COURT: Right?
- MR. KAROTKIN: Well, let me address -- let me address
- 23 | that. Let's assume it was a layup. It doesn't matter. It
- doesn't matter because there are no insiders in this plan. And
- 25 the only evidence as to insider status is Mr. Mistry's

- declaration which says why they're not insiders. So by
- 2 definition --
- 3 THE COURT: Well --
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: -- if this is a non-insider plan --
- 5 THE COURT: I can stop you there. I told Mr. Laffredi
- 6 | right in the opening argument this morning that the Mistry
- 7 declaration did at least establish a prima facie --
- 8 MR. KAROTKIN: Exactly.
- 9 THE COURT: -- of no insider. But what about
- 10 | 503(b)(3), whatever the other subsection is? There's still a
- 11 | predicate you have to establish, right?
- MR. KAROTKIN: The predicate of 503 --
- 13 THE COURT: I've got my subsections mixed up.
- 14 MR. KAROTKIN: -- 503(c) I think.
- THE COURT: You know what I'm talking about.
- MR. KAROTKIN: I think it's 503(c). The predicate is
- 17 | the same predicate as under -- the case law, again, is clear.
- 18 It's the same predicate as under Section 363 of the Bankruptcy
- 19 Code as to whether it's an appropriate exercise of the business
- 20 judgment.
- 21 THE COURT: No. I don't think that's what it says.
- 22 Let's look at the --
- MR. KAROTKIN: Well, it says justified by the facts
- 24 and circumstances of the case.
- THE COURT: Yeah, right.

MR. KAROTKIN: And if you read the case law, which I'm sure you have -- and again, we cited that in our pleadings, the case law that interprets that has said it's essentially the same as an application under 363(b) to use property of the estate outside the ordinary course of business. And even if it was something more than that, if you look at the Dana factors that we've cited in our opening brief, we have complied with all of the Dana factors.

And again, there's no evidence to the contrary, no evidence. Mr. Julian and the other gentleman stood up here and testified for like forty-five minutes. That's not evidence. The evidence is undisputed as to the debtors' business judgment, as to the rationale for the program, as to what the compensation committee considered in terms of metrics, as to the input from professional advisors, as to the broad base of the program, as to the rationale for the incentives. It's all there. There is no evidence to suggest otherwise.

All we have is colloquy from counsel about what happened two years ago or a year ago or five years ago. This is a prospective plan, and this, again, Your Honor, the unsecured creditors' committee represents in excess of 23 billion dollars of claims. Mr. Botter's clients have eight billion dollars of claims, pre-petition, unsecured claims. The same type of claims the tort claimants' committee have in terms of priority under the statute.

The ad hoc committee of subrogation claimants that hold billions of dollars of claims didn't object to this program. The ad hoc committee of equity security holders didn't object to this program. They recognize, as Mr. Bray pointed out, the rationale for it and why it is essential to value maximization and to the success of these cases, and that's all we're trying to achieve here.

We're very sympathetic to the wildfire claimants and what they've suffered. We're not minimizing that, but as I said, Your Honor, this is not an issue of retribution and punishment. This is an issue of what's proper to operate the business on a prospective basis and to motivate employees to achieve the goals of the company, safety, economic performance, in order to facilitate this reorganization, this reorganization case and Your Honor, get a distribution to those entitled to a distribution as soon as possible.

And again, as I said at the outset, depriving these people, these 10,000 employees of the opportunity to achieve market-based compensation is not going to get these people paid faster. It's not.

THE COURT: No, I understand that. I understand that.

MR. KAROTKIN: Now, we have gone to great lengths to satisfy every single information request here. There is not one outstanding request from the tort committee or anybody else that hasn't been satisfied or they told us they wouldn't take

1 | it because it would be confidential.

And as I said, FTI was crawling all over us and got all the information they needed. It enabled them to make an informed judgment and to suggest the changes that we agreed to. And again, increasing the safety metric to sixty-five percent, addressing one of Mr. Julian's points, changing the individual performance modifier to make it work both up and down, up and down, adjustments up and down; again, one of Mr. Julian's points.

THE COURT: And explain that a little more because again, these are words to me when I am looking at a three-page something and trying to -- and no one is sitting there explaining to me. So I read the words. I see there's an adjustment but take the creditors' committees, what you've just said, and I've got their STIP from their position here.

MR. KAROTKIN: Let me try to explain.

THE COURT: What does it do to the IPM (ph.)?

MR. KAROTKIN: Under the original proposal, the IPM, which would have been applied quarterly under the original proposal and only allowed upward adjustments, was changed to apply annually --

22 THE COURT: Supplement to award, their STIP'd twenty-23 five percent of the total value of their STIP?

MR. KAROTKIN: Yes, but now it can go up or down. So there could be a downward adjustment. Before there was not --

- a downward adjustment was not permitted. So again, to address
 the unsecured creditors' committee's concern that there should
 be a downward adjustment, that has been addressed.
 - THE COURT: Okay. I want to -- now I am looking at the stipulation. It says, "will be applied on an annual" -- now, okay. So does -- that means not paid, right?

7 MR. KAROTKIN: Correct.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

- THE COURT: Applied annual. So am I correct that, if I go with the adjusted plan that the committee and the debtor worked out, there will be quarterly payments but not -- but there will be only a lesser -- a lesser amount of quarterly payments.
- MR. KAROTKIN: There won't be an ability to increase it --
- THE COURT: Right, right.
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- for the --
- 17 THE COURT: So then at the end of year, an individual 18 will know that he or she is getting something, and this is 19 where I am trying to understand it a little more carefully. So 20 it says, "The IPM will be applied annually" -- well, it says 21 "applied on an annual", it doesn't say paid but I will 22 accept -- take your word for it. "The IPM will be based upon 23 year-end performance, potential range from zero to 150 for 24 upward and downward", but there was a -- oh.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Before it was applied quarterly and --

1 THE COURT: No, no, I am sorry. No, it -- then 2 explain the -- I didn't -- okay. What confused me, as I was 3 trying to absorb all this, because I just got this last night, 4 was the difference between -- set forth in paragraph 3 of the 5 STIP -- of the notice, and that's the threshold maximum 6 targets. That's different. That's not IPM. 7 MR. KAROTKIN: Correct. 8 THE COURT: So explain what that means in --9 MR. KAROTKIN: That means --10 THE COURT: -- layman's terms. 11 MR. KAROTKIN: I will try to do that. For the 12 financial metric, which I think has been reduced to twenty-five 13 percent; is that correct? Twenty-five percent? 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. 15 MR. KAROTKIN: Yeah, twenty-five percent. 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 MR. KAROTKIN: In order to receive a target payment, 18 you would have to achieve ninety percent of the metric, and in 19 order to achieve a higher payout, you would have to receive --20 you would have to achieve 110 percent to get the maximum. 21 it's been increased from 105 to 100 percent -- 110 percent to 22 get the maximum payout and reduced from 95 percent to 90 23 percent, to get the minimum payout. 24 THE COURT: See one of the things that was confusing 25 is it makes it impossible for anybody to understand this, if

- you don't have any background, is that the STIP awards as set
 as set forth originally has a range, and the range goes from
 performance -- it goes from performance level to 50 percent to
- 5 MR. KAROTKIN: Based on all of the metrics taken

150 percent, like -- it's kind of like --

- THE COURT: I know, but don't you see I'm not -- I

 don't know this stuff. So I am reading thing, and so that

 means that the -- what is the target is in the middle and

 threshold is fifty percent, but I think that sounds like -- to

 me, like it might be a layup, but I'm still trying to

 understand the adjustments here, so have been changed from 95

 to 105 of target.
 - See, that's what throws me off. Where's the 95 that now is 105? The number ninety-five doesn't appear in the award range language. Do you see? Am I misreading it, or are you -- or am I --
- MR. KAROTKIN: That's within the -- some of the granularity of how it's applied.
- THE COURT: Yeah, right.
- 21 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay?

4

6

14

15

16

17

together.

- 22 THE COURT: Yeah, like, therefore, I don't understand 23 it. Okay. Let me just read the words together. But it seems 24 like it increases the threshold. Maybe that's what I am --
- MR. KAROTKIN: It makes it more difficult to achieve

- 1 the max.
- THE COURT: Well, it is just more difficult to achieve
- 3 the threshold; isn't it?
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: No, it's a little --
- 5 THE COURT: And also the max, right?
- 6 MR. KAROTKIN: -- it's more difficult to achieve --
- 7 | it's a little easier to receive the minimum, but much -- but
- 8 more difficult to achieve the higher levels.
- 9 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry, did you want to --
- MR. KAROTKIN: No, no.
- 11 THE COURT: Were you going to tell me something?
- MR. KAROTKIN: I was just making sure I explained it
- 13 correctly.
- 14 THE COURT: I will take your word for it. Well, I --
- as I say, it's very difficult for me to read something that is
- 16 in Greek and then be told that we've changed the number from
- one number to another number, and neither number is in there to
- 18 begin with. So I have to just try to understand it, and I'll
- 19 | accept your explanation that it's granular, but that doesn't
- 20 make it easy.
- MR. KAROTKIN: And again, this was done as a result
- 22 of --
- THE COURT: Yeah.
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- the in-depth analysis of FTI and
- 25 AlixPartners together, to arrive at this compromise.

```
1
              Your Honor, I can't emphasize enough the importance of
 2
     bringing stability to this workforce. I can't emphasize it
 3
     enough. It's a very uncertain situation. The failure to pay
 4
     the 2018 STIP has been a terrifically unstabilizing event in
 5
     the life of these employees.
 6
              THE COURT: Do I have some evidence of that?
 7
              MR. KAROTKIN: Hum?
              THE COURT: I believe you --
 8
 9
              MR. KAROTKIN: And --
10
              THE COURT: -- but is there any evidence of that?
11
              MR. KAROTKIN: Pardon me?
12
              THE COURT: Any evidence of that? Again, you were
13
     faulting the other side for lack of evidence. Is there any
14
     evidence that there's been an unstabilizing factor?
15
              MR. KAROTKIN: If you want, we can put someone on the
16
     stand, and they will tell you --
17
              THE COURT: Well, no, but I --
18
              MR. KAROTKIN: -- that, yes.
19
              THE COURT: That's what I don't want to do today.
20
              MR. KAROTKIN: In fact, there's been already more
21
     attrition than last year but --
22
              THE COURT: Just make me an offer of proof for now.
23
              MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.
2.4
              THE COURT: Like what would the offer of proof be?
25
              MR. KAROTKIN: I will -- offer of proof that there's
```

- been an increase in attrition from prior years at all levels of
- 2 | the company, and I think that Mr. Mistry would attest to that.
- 3 He's here in court.
- I think that, Your Honor, again, this is prospective.
- 5 What happened in the past is large --
- 6 THE COURT: No, I got that.
- 7 MR. KAROTKIN: -- is largely irrelevant, and again,
- 8 | the unsecured creditors, Mr. Bray's clients and the others,
- 9 they recognize the importance of the workforce to the stability
- 10 of this enterprise and the maximization of value. They realize
- 11 that they have to be appropriately incentivized. It's not fair
- 12 to punish them and not give them the opportunity.
- THE COURT: No, you're repeating yourself. I don't --
- 14 I understand your point. So go ahead, and if there are other
- points you want to get, you may do it. If not, I'll thank you
- 16 for your presentation. It's your call.
- MR. KAROTKIN: No, I have nothing else, but again, we
- 18 | would urge Your Honor to approve it.
- 19 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I hadn't intended asking for
- 20 | any reply, but I will you -- ask Mr. Julian, I will give you an
- 21 opportunity if you want to respond, and you're the only one I
- 22 am going to call on at this point.
- And I'll come back -- now that you've heard the other
- 24 | side's argument and probably no surprise to you, I want you to
- 25 be the advocate for the victims you represent but be an officer

- 1 of the Court today, telling a bankruptcy judge on what I'm 2 supposed to do in terms of what is somewhat typical or a 3 complicated Chapter 11, of having some sort of a conversation, 4 recognition, and forget all the horrible things and focus on 5
- 6 MR. JULIAN: That sounds like an easy thing to do and 7 so --
- 8 THE COURT: Easy, right.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What do I do about it?

- 9 MR. JULIAN: -- considering the points I have to make, 10 that's a tall order, but let me start at the beginning.
- 11 THE COURT: Well, you're up to it. You've always 12 been -- as long as I've known you, you've never been bashful to 13 come out making a good argument.
 - MR. JULIAN: Let me correct the record first, Your Honor. Mr. Karotkin said that I received every single document I asked for. He's -- I don't fault him for saying that. He's not aware of what we were doing with the Cravath firm and some other lawyers in his firm.
 - On March 8th, 2019, according to my email, and I say this under oath under penalty of perjury, I sent an email to Toby Keller, Kevin Orsini of the Cravath firm, and "On behalf of the tort claimant's committee, as counsel, this email requests Pacific Gas & Electric Company, and PG&E Corporation, to produce to the committee's counsel within the next four weeks, the following documents without a Rule 2004 examination

```
PG&E Corporation, et al.
 1
     order."
 2
              I have thirty-two requests. They all deal with
 3
     management but --
 4
              THE COURT: Management.
 5
              MR. JULIAN: Management issues --
 6
              THE COURT: Okay.
 7
              MR. JULIAN: -- in my view. Number eight was the
 8
     companies' minutes and summaries of meetings, discussions, and
 9
     resolution of the companies' and the boards' respective
10
     committees, including without limitation, the audit and
11
     compensation committee meetings during the applicable period.
12
              Now, the applicable period was the time leading up to
13
     the present, but they stiff-armed us. They didn't give us
14
     anything.
15
              THE COURT: Well, so you say March 8th.
                                                        So that was
16
     well after Mr. Simon's e-note (phonetic) --
17
              MR. JULIAN: Yeah.
18
              THE COURT: -- and well, it was around --
19
              MR. JULIAN: I mean, the point was we were in
20
     litigation.
21
                          Was it around the time or already after
              THE COURT:
22
     the filed the original STIP motion? I quess it probably was.
23
              MR. JULIAN: I think they filed it on March 6th.
2.4
              THE COURT: Yeah.
```

MR. JULIAN: So -- but that's beside the point. It's

25

- 1 their burden to come forward with the metrics, and my whole
- 2 problem is, it's not in the declaration. I took the
- depositions on the declarations of Mistry and Friske, and it's
- 4 | not in there, and I asked and the answer that I got back on the
- 5 metric performance scoring was they look at the miles. And he
- 6 didn't have any other information.
- 7 I just think it's, for lack of a better term, and in
- 8 this case maybe it's not a good term; it's a DOA on that point
- 9 alone. It doesn't satisfy the basics --
- 10 THE COURT: Well, but I'm confused about something.
- 11 You asked for thirty-two things. You mentioned number eight
- was minutes of committee meetings, and then you said, when you
- deposed Mr. Mistry, he said miles. I mean, are you complaining
- 14 | that you didn't get the minutes or because Mr. --
- MR. JULIAN: Well, I think I should have got minutes.
- THE COURT: Well, maybe you should have, right, and
- maybe you should have, but you're not going back now, are you,
- 18 | to say well, you should have -- I mean, aren't you -- your
- 19 point, I guess, is that Mr. Mistry's response was inadequate in
- 20 your --
- MR. JULIAN: Yes, yes.
- 22 THE COURT: -- opinion.
- MR. JULIAN: Yes, and I didn't have any minutes to
- 24 evaluate.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

Let me address the main point, which is we're judging

1 a prospective plan by the past. The main point I made was that 2 we are looking at the future, and the future, we can't have 3 wildfire claims, and there are no metrics in this plan to tell 4 us how they're going to score. So there's no incentive.

What we're really saying to you, the U.S. Trustee and we, this incentive plan doesn't incentivize people for wildfire safety because the scoring is so easily. It's a farce, in essence.

THE COURT: Well, but you're arguing that. You haven't --

11 MR. JULIAN: The --

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

21

22

layup.

- 12 THE COURT: You want me to --
- 13 MR. JULIAN: It's not my burden, not my burden.

14 THE COURT: Well, leave aside burdens, and let's talk 15 about the state of affairs. Your view -- well, I mean, I 16 presume the other side would say it met its prima facie case, 17 and you don't think they've done sufficiently, but they have 18 made some presentation. You just think it's a farce or it's a 19

MR. JULIAN: I think I've poked holes in it enough to say that they have to produce those metrics. What should you May I address that?

23 THE COURT: Well, yeah. I mean, you talked about it 24 before and so on, but again --

25 MR. JULIAN: I think you ought to deny this motion

- completely. They can come back with a different motion that is key to employees that they're worried about walking out the
- door. And counsel wants evidence? I would refer Your Honor to
- 4 page 111 of Mr. Mistry's deposition transcript where I ask:
- 5 "Q. To your knowledge, has anyone left PG&E to below market
- 6 compensation since the bankruptcy filing?
- 7 "A. I think people have said that they have left the company
- 8 due to the uncertainty the company is facing. I've heard
- 9 anecdotally that not paying the 2018 STIP has had an impact on
- 10 people's engagement. I haven't had somebody directly come to
- me and say I'm leaving the company because my pay is below
- 12 market."
- Look, I knew what you were going to wonder about in
- 14 this case, so I asked the question in the deposition. I'm as
- 15 | concerned as you are about that point, but this plan goes far
- 16 too broadly than what we should be concerned about, which is
- 17 | incentivizing some employees. What I would look at is how far
- 18 is their base pay out of whack with their peers? And by peers,
- 19 I take issue with their point that the utility industry is
- 20 their peers in the fifty states. It is not. Only one state is
- 21 | facing the death and destruction that this utility has wrought,
- 22 and it's this state, and San Diego Gas & Electric are the
- peers.
- And so what I would look at is what SoCal Edison and
- 25 | San Diego Gas & Electric did with respect to their employees

1 and figure out how much --

THE COURT: I mean, I don't know how I would know you're right. There've been fires in the northwest, right?

And fires in other parts of the country. This isn't all about fires. They're -- I mean, how do I do that? I mean, how do I just discount some of the data but take into account the other data?

MR. JULIAN: I submit there have been no fires in the press like we have heard in California.

THE COURT: Of course, I agree.

MR. JULIAN: And my point is, you're asking me what to do. I would deny it, send them back to the drawing board if they want to address some of the employees, including the union folks, who obviously have an issue here with their contract, and first, take a look, as I mentioned in my conclusion in my brief, take a look at whether the base pay is out of whack. Then how much do you want to incentivize them. But more importantly, when you come back, show us how you're scoring it, whether it's a layup or not, and whether it's really going to incentivize wildfire safety.

And last but not least, it's my hope that they would even raise the wildfire metric again because, as I said, it's not about the past. If we have another wildfire and our victim lawyers are convinced that they're not doing everything possible -- well that's not evidence, I'm just telling you the

way it is -- we're going to have another fire, and we should
not be encouraging them through a STIP to do something that is
not going to ameliorate the threat.

THE COURT: Wait, I have one more question for you.

MR. JULIAN: And last but not least --

6 THE COURT: Well, okay.

MR. JULIAN: -- I don't criticize the bondholders or the unsecured creditors' committee for saying what they do. I don't think they're as sensitized to the plight of the victims as the CEO Simon was in his February 22 letter or our committee.

THE COURT: Well, that's what I was going to ask you. How do I ignore or discount a substantial interest represented by dollars, huge amounts of dollar claim? Again, I'm not -- this is not like a baseball game where I'm scoring the runs by saying you got more dollars -- they got more dollars than you. That's not the point. They've got effort; they've got input; they've got advisors; and it isn't as though someone on the debtors' side has decided just to disregard all the safety factors. So is there a way that I should decide to just ignore their will here and their wishes?

MR. JULIAN: No, I don't think you should, but I think
you're --

24 THE COURT: Well, you want me to disapprove it and start over.

1 MR. JULIAN: It's April 9.

mean you talked before about -- I mean, I explained my own concerns that, without you, if you had not even shown up today, I still was going to say I don't understand this stuff. And I might very well have asked Mr. Mistry to take the stand, or I still might ask him to come back and explain what does this mean in terms that are not familiar to someone like -- without the background in this. And that might be necessary for me to have a better understanding to know what I'm agreeing to, but I don't know whether that will solve the problem. Same with Mr. Laffredi's suggestion: do I go to the trouble of having 10,000 people's personal information disclosed to anybody, when it's not even necessary? You're not advocating that.

MR. JULIAN: I'm not asking for that.

THE COURT: And so you seem to be focusing mostly on proving up the legitimacy of these metrics and comparing them, at least, with the other California companies. That seem to be the major factors that you focused on, I think; maybe I'm misstating it for you, but I -- I mean, I don't want to hear about your squirrel that got killed. I want to focus on --

MR. JULIAN: I'm not going to do it.

23 THE COURT: -- about the metrics.

24 MR. JULIAN: It's not the metrics. Well, the metrics
25 should be higher, but the big point is, it's the scoring that

1 | allows this company to score themselves --

THE COURT: Yeah, okay.

3 MR. JULIAN: -- 1.5 or 1. -- it's the scoring --

4 THE COURT: Well, it's a part of the function. I

5 mean, it's --

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1325

MR. JULIAN: And Mr. Mistry, call him all you want on the stand; he does not have information on that, according to what he testified, other than that he knows it's done by miles and he doesn't know anything else. So what we think is, you didn't cause this problem; I didn't cause this problem; employees didn't cause this problem. They didn't bring us the record that they should have -- number one. Number two, the dollars are just too large. And number three, with the quarterly thing, the cow gets out of the barn before we find out if they really were performing. Nine months -- the campfire was not November 8th. Nine months can go by, they get their quarterly payments, and then there's an annual review --

THE COURT: Okay, again, I don't want to bore everybody in the room to death by my questions to you. I'm supposed to make a decision, and I will do my best to make a decision.

MR. JULIAN: Plus those four points.

THE COURT: But my problem is this, again, and I'm going to share the problem and you give me a solution. Mr.

25 Karotkin's correct, and you know the law. There is business

judgment involved here and there are professional judgments and there are highly trained and highly qualified people on both sides of the fight here. And I'm supposed to know better than they that we should go back to an annual thing rather than a quarterly? I mean, that's what -- I don't know how I know what the right answer is. And I can't be Solomon-like. I guess I could; I guess I will make it semi-annual and you got a deal, or change the percentages to five more percent, six more That's why we have professionals and business judgment, right?

So other than to start all over again, which is one of your alternatives, what would be effective? Would it be effective to have Mr. Mistry come back and explain all these details, or do we have to go back to another round of pre-trial discovery and depositions and so on?

MR. JULIAN: I think if they gave us the document that shows how they propose to score this, and if it's honest and complete, that would be the end of it. If not, it would be a deposition.

But I disagree that this is the product of business judgment for reasons we've talked about. Their consultant spent twenty to forty hours, if I recall his deposition, on this. He never looked at the PUC -- Your Honor, I haven't talked about this. He never looked at the PUC order saying it should be fully revamped. Now, they say they looked at it,

didn't give it to the consultant, but that's not a consultant
looking at everything. He never looked at his own in-house
report on San Diego Gas. And by the way, they've now admit I'm
right on that. They upped the safety metrics to sixty-five in
their settlement with the UCC.

THE COURT: So if I tell Mr. Karotkin that I want a further hearing and I want Mr. Mistry on the stand to explain the metrics and explain the scoring, is that going to be something that you can listen and cross-examine? Or is it something you're going to demand that we have a further hearing and further evidence and further discussions about -- discover everything he's going to want? Is this going to be something that's going to be helpful to your inquiry?

MR. JULIAN: No, because he testified that he doesn't know anything about that other than miles. I need the fellow -- I need the witness who knows the answers to that, and then the answer is yes.

THE COURT: Or else there's no answer.

19 MR. JULIAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. JULIAN: I need the documents, the compensation committee minutes, the documents they relied upon, the WTW report, the consulting report, and the scoring of the documents, basically explain how they're going to implement this thing, and that witness. I need to depose that witness.

1 THE COURT: What I am trying to do is to see if 2 there's a way to move to a conclusion one way or the other and 3 if, in order to have the kind of proof that you want, I have to 4 start -- and we start essentially a whole pre-trial process. 5 It'll take quite a long time and a lot of information. Meanwhile, we have employees; we have morale; we have the need 6 7 to get some finality to this issue. And so I got your point, 8 and I'll take it into consideration here. 9 MR. JULIAN: We'll they gave something to the 10 unsecured creditors' committee, so whatever they gave them, 11 we'd want. But --12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. JULIAN: But I certainly need the documents that 14 explain how they're going to implement this, and a witness who 15 knows what he's talking about, as opposed to Mr. Mistry, who 16 was the HR guy who recommended it based upon other people's 17 advice. 18 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to take another break. 19 Oh, Mr. Karotkin, you want a minute. MR. KAROTKIN: May have one minute? 20 21 THE COURT: I have -- more response. 22 MR. KAROTKIN: Again, I think, Your Honor, you put the 23 finger on it when you said that's why the case law says you are 24 to rely on the business judgment of the people who make these 25 decisions and are familiar with the business. And this whole

- 1 thing about the metrics and how the metrics work, in many
- 2 respects that irrelevant here because there are no insiders
- 3 involved in this thing. And if thing were reasonable and
- 4 rational, it could have been a KERP, and incentives wouldn't
- 5 have mattered at all. But as I said before, what we have now
- 6 is better than that.
- 7 THE COURT: Well, I know you said that, but you're
- 8 assuming that I understand it.
- 9 MR. KAROTKIN: But again, Your Honor --
- 10 THE COURT: And I'm telling you I don't understand it.
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- this could be a pure retention plan
- 12 with no metrics, with no incentives.
- THE COURT: But I was asked to approve it.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Okay.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KAROTKIN: Again, but it's better than that.
- 17 THE COURT: Okay, I know what you're saying.
- MR. KAROTKIN: And you could approve it simply on the
- 19 basis of it being a KERP if you wanted to because, again,
- 20 | there's more --
- 21 THE COURT: Mr. Karotkin --
- MR. KAROTKIN: -- more than enough justification in
- 23 the record for that.
- 24 THE COURT: -- if I'm just getting paid to make a
- decision, I might as well not read any brief. I might as well

- 1 just say, done.
- 2 MR. KAROTKIN: No, Your Honor, I think that --
- 3 THE COURT: I'm supposed to understand this, and I
- 4 | don't understand it, and Mr. Julian is focusing on some things
- 5 that he'd like to dig in on, but I don't understand it.
- 6 MR. KAROTKIN: Mr. Julian is focusing on delay, okay?
- 7 THE COURT: Well, I don't think so.
- 8 MR. KAROTKIN: That's what he's focusing on.
- 9 THE COURT: Well, I know I'm not.
- 10 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. I think that's clear, what Mr.
- Julian is focusing on is delay and retribution, not looking out
- 12 for the interests of this company. I think that's clear.
- MR. JULIAN: Your Honor, we'll do it in ten days.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I don't know that that'll
- 15 happen. All right. I'm going to take a ten-minute break and
- 16 I'll come back and try to give you a ruling. I will give you a
- 17 | ruling. I won't try; I will give you a ruling. Ten minutes.
- 18 (Recess from 12:54 p.m., until 1:12 p.m.)
- 19 THE CLERK: All rise.
- 20 THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you for your
- 21 patience. One second.
- Okay, well, I didn't want to keep you waiting, so I'm
- 23 | going to -- I may be a little disorganized, but I'll do my
- 24 best. And I'm sorry if I keep coughing; I'm not going to drink
- any more water.

I appreciate the advocacy on both sides and on all sides and the hard work that you've all put in, and it's a difficult question to deal with. I'm not going to grant the motion today, but I'm not going to deny it. I'm going to take it in one more step, and here, I'll explain.

First of all, I'll tell you what I'm not going to do.

I'm not persuaded that there are insiders such that Bankruptcy

Code Section 503(c)(1) is implicated. And I believe, at best,

I have to test the options being presented to me under

503(c)(3), which is a very subjective thing in the total

circumstances of the case, and I believe that the debtor and

its representatives have satisfied me that the circumstances of

the case justify some sort of relief here. And I'm prepared to

do that, which is why I'm not going to deny the motion, even

though that's been requested by the other side.

But I cannot escape the fact that this case is not like other cases. It's not like the run-of-the -- not run-of-the-mill; that's the wrong word -- the many cases cited in the briefs about insiders, conflicts of officers, business judgment, et cetera, in the context, other than in this setting in a bankruptcy. They are helpful but not dispositive.

The issue here, to me, is, as I explained to Mr.

Karotkin in the closing comments, I have to -- and I have all along in my own career on the bench -- tried to defer to business judgment, and only in the rare cases when I believe

1 that the judgment has not been properly carried out or complied 2 with have I overruled a decision of a debtor-in-possession. 3 And here, I am mindful -- and I believe that there has been an 4 exercise of business judgment, but I'm not prepared to approve 5 it yet for the reasons that I touched on in the prior remarks. 6 I still don't fully understand it; now, maybe I'll never fully 7 understand it, but I have to have a sense that this business 8 judgment that has been executed by the debtor has a foundation

and justifies what they want me to do.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And let me say, by my making that comment, I am discounting and disregarding several things that have been said by several counsel. I am not of the opinion that there's been bad faith here by the proponents of the STIP. I don't believe that there've been any disqualifying conflicts by the representatives of the compensation committee who have endorsed it. But similarly, I do not attribute to the fire victims' committee's counsel being vindictive. I believe it's more -it's important for him and for the other victims whose representatives spoke today to come to some solution. And ultimately, that is the goal of everyone, I hope, in this case; it's certainly my goal. But I'm not going to let the employee groups become, I'll say, innocent victims by -- and "innocent" is not -- it's a sense that if there's a person who is culpable, that person should not be rewarded. But the vast majority, clearly -- and no one has said to the contrary -- the

vast majority of the employees of the company generally, and the vast majority of the 10,000 or so who are the intended beneficiaries of the STIP are not anything other than employees doing their job and perhaps doing it under circumstances when they must be, every day, be besieged by the criticisms of whatever's wrong with the utility, whether it's their view of the world; you know, I get a lot of letters reminding me what I ought to do with this utility. But that's not fair to the individuals who are out there doing their job. And I learned from the prior PG&E case that there's a "hate the utility" mentality, and there's probably modern versions of it that says to hate other folks that you depend upon extensively, and you hate them until you need them.

But anyway, I do not want to turn this into my wanting to make those employees be disadvantaged or inconvenienced by delays, in which case -- which is why I'm going to insist we move closer and quickly to a resolution.

Because the case is so unusual -- everyone knows it; I don't need to say it. It has political ramifications; personal ramifications for the victims; financial ramifications for the creditors who aren't getting paid or for parties, counterparties whose contracts might be rejected; it has environmental issues; it has criminal proceedings going on elsewhere. It has more complexity than I can imagine, and the employees shouldn't be treated as hostages or punished.

But this thing has to not only be right; it has to feel right, and it doesn't quite feel right yet, from my point of view, if I don't understand it. And so having said -- and I'm repeating to some extent what I said before we took a break -- I'm supposed to know what I'm doing. And if I don't know what I'm doing, I'm supposed to rely on the professionals. And when I reread the 2019 STIP awards and the award ranges and the individual performance modifiers, I simply don't know how to translate them to apply to the case here. And then when I read all the performance metrics and weighting, again, there's no specifics. I have an outline that's completely understandable and rational, but I can't apply flesh to the bones, if you will, and I need to understand it more.

So I am not going to toss this thing in the garbage can, as some might ask, and start over again. I'm going to have a continuance where I'm going to give the debtor, through its representative, presumably Mr. Mistry, but whomever, an opportunity to come back and take the witness stand and educate me on how this thing works, and to turn specifically to a couple of points that were made in the prior argument, the metrics, and the scoring. In other words, how do they work? I'm not going to do what Mr. Julian says and take time for him to go examine everything and the board minutes and depose everybody.

I'm going to have a continued hearing, which I'll tell

1 you in a minute when I think is the time to do it. And I 2 will -- before we conclude today, I'll set aside a fixed period 3 of time, and during that time, I want the debtor's 4 representatives to put on the witness stand the individuals who 5 can best explain to me why and how this operates and how it 6 should be applied. So whether it means explaining how many 7 miles of wild vegetation need to be cleared or how many times 8 somebody has to do the underground testing to see where the 9 power lines are, or anything else, something so when we're 10 done, I can at least understand how these metrics work and how 11 they translate to the application of the awards.

I do not and will not insist that there be a disclosure of the individuals, their personal information and so on. In another time and another place, I might have insisted that that be at least filed under seal. I don't think that's necessary. As I say, I'm satisfied that we don't have an insider issue.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So to summarize it, if I left you confused -- I hope you're not confused -- I want to have a continued hearing where representatives from the debtor will take the stand and explain to me in nontechnical terms -- these are people who are experts in their field of employee and executive compensation and rewards, and I'm a bankruptcy judge. So I want the witness to tell me, like in a tutorial, this is how this thing works.

I will give Mr. Julian or other counsel a brief

opportunity to cross-examine on specifically those things that the witnesses tell me about. I'm not going to turn it into, as I say, a pre-trial discovery.

It is essentially the invitation to the debtor to tell me why I can be comfortable knowing that the business judgment has been executed properly or competently. That's the wrong word; I don't question the competence of the experts. But clearly so that -- to use the terms of Mr. Julian and the other counsel, that this isn't a layup. Mr. Karotkin seemed confident that it's not. And all somebody has to do is let me understand it myself. And I will listen, and I will listen to the arguments, and I will make a ruling at that point. And so I'm making a ruling by saying I need a further hearing to get this clarification.

I propose that we do it quickly. I previously blocked April 23rd for personal reasons, but those reasons, although they're personal, they're only in the morning. I can do the afternoon of April 23rd, and I'm willing to do it at 1:30 on that day and set aside at least a two-hour presentation by the debtor through its representatives. But again, not lawyer argument; lawyer presenting, witness explaining. They don't have to take the total time if they want to. The homework assignment is to educate the judge on how the metrics and the weighting work and how they're applied to the STIP awards as proposed.

1 And as I say, I am not going to make the 10,000 2 employees dangle in the wind, are we going to get our pay or 3 not -- their extra pay. They're entitled to it if I can reach 4 that point of satisfaction of understanding what's going on. I 5 know that's not a perfect solution, but it's the solution that 6 I need to do in order to carry out my assignment. 7 So unless somebody has some particular question or is 8 particularly inconvenienced by the date, I don't need any 9 further discussion. 10 So Mr. Karotkin, I'll put it to you. 11 MR. JULIAN: I have a question, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Yeah. 13 You can just stay there. Well, okay; now you're up. 14 MR. JULIAN: As I understand it, there's no cross-15 examination by us; it's just a presentation by the debtor? 16 THE COURT: No, no. I said I'll give you a brief 17 opportunity to cross-examine. 18 MR. JULIAN: Well, having deposed Mr. Mistry --19 THE COURT: I didn't say who the witness is. I don't 20 care who the witness is. 2.1 MR. JULIAN: Well, what I'm saying --22 THE COURT: I want -- it's like a tutorial. 23 MR. JULIAN: Right, but I need the documents that 24 they're basing their testimony on. There's no way I can cross-25 examine them.

1 THE COURT: If they want me to consider documents, 2 they'll have to make them available to you. But what I'm 3 saying is, it's going to be done quickly and --4 MR. JULIAN: Got it. 5 THE COURT: -- succinctly. Okay? 6 MR. JULIAN: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Karotkin? And if the date's no good, 8 we'll find another date. 9 MR. KAROTKIN: No, that's fine. April 23rd is fine; 10 we'll be ready. I assume no depositions prior to that time? 11 THE COURT: I'd rather not make any rules because I 12 don't want to -- I said that I'm going to move quickly, and if 13 you can bring me around third base and get me home, you'll get 14 your run scored. And so if that means that Mr. Julian wants a 15 deposition or he wants a document or something, I encourage you 16 to cooperate so that he can't complain. If it can't be done, 17 it can't be done. 18 MR. KAROTKIN: Okay. 19 THE COURT: My goal is to give you an up or down at 20 the end of that hearing, and your homework assignment and your 21 client's is to educate me on the points that I made. 22 MR. KAROTKIN: We will do so, sir. 23 THE COURT: And as I say, I'll say what I don't want. 24 I don't want any more briefing on the business judgment rule,

on the calculations under 503, on anything.

25

1 Facts -- it's like -- again, to use the concept, it's 2 like a tutorial. If we were on a patent case, you would have a 3 tutorial telling the judge about patent technology. I'm not 4 clueless about employee compensation, but I need to apply it to 5 this case. And so --6 MR. JULIAN: One other question, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 8 MR. JULIAN: You want to use the procedure we 9 sometimes use where they've filed a declaration doing what you 10 just said? 11 THE COURT: No. 12 MR. JULIAN: No? Got it. 13 THE COURT: I want a live witness. 14 MR. JULIAN: Got it. 15 THE COURT: I want a live witness to tell me, and that 16 witness can sit there and tell me how I need to understand 17 this. 18 MR. JULIAN: I'm saying, would it be helpful to have 19 the declaration and put the witness on the stand to talk about 20 the --2.1 THE COURT: I don't want the declaration in advance. 22 MR. JULIAN: Got it. 23 MR. KAROTKIN: We understand. 24 THE COURT: Again, I'm making this up for my own 25 purpose.

- 1 MR. JULIAN: Got it. We'll do it.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- 3 MR. JULIAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 4 MR. KAROTKIN: Thank you, sir.
- 5 THE COURT: Thank you for your time, everyone.
- 6 MS. KIM: Your Honor? I'm sorry.
- 7 THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Kim.
- 8 MS. KIM: Just one very quick housekeeping matter.
- 9 The four retention applica -- actually, all the retention
- 10 applications, but the four in particular that the debtors filed
- 11 that you approved earlier this morning, ages ago, we have
- 12 uploaded orders on those in connection with our request for
- 13 entry of default.
- The comments that you made to us about the proposed
- orders for the Weil firm and for Keller & Benvenutti that there
- 16 | weren't any findings of -- you weren't going to make any
- 17 | findings regarding disinterestedness and then for --
- THE COURT: Well, I didn't do anything. I mean, I
- 19 just -- you made your representation. Yeah.
- MS. KIM: Yeah, so the orders don't have those
- 21 | findings and don't have anything with respect to our
- 22 withdrawal.
- 23 THE COURT: The only order I -- it seemed to me that
- your firm's needed to be changed only on the question of
- 25 withdrawal if there's an issue.

- 1 MS. KIM: Would you like that specified? Because it doesn't have anything in the order itself about withdrawal.
- 3 THE COURT: Well, I thought the application just
- 4 reserved the right to it.
- 5 MS. KIM: The engagement letter that was signed has a 6 reservation of --
- 7 THE COURT: Well, why don't you put it in the order.
- 8 MS. KIM: Okay.
- 9 THE COURT: I mean, it's not a big deal. I don't --
- 10 MS. KIM: No, that's fine. I just wanted to know if
- 11 the -- and for the other --
- 12 THE COURT: And then the Baker & Hostettler order just
- is going to have a --
- MS. KIM: That's not ours, so --
- THE COURT: Okay. They're here somewhere in the room?
- MS. KIM: Yeah, um-hum.
- 17 THE COURT: They're going to upload an order that just
- 18 clarifies on the guidelines.
- MS. KIM: So then for the three other debtor orders,
- 20 | would you like us to reupload them or --
- 21 THE COURT: No, I'll sign them.
- MS. KIM: Okay.
- THE COURT: We got them.
- MS. KIM: And we'll do the Keller & Benvenutti one.
- 25 Thank you.

	PG&E Corporation, et al.
1	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
2	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 1:28 PM)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Michael Drake, certify that the foregoing transcript is a
4	true and accurate record of the proceedings.
5	
6	$M \cap P \cap P$
7	Mill Cal
8	
9	/s/ MICHAEL DRAKE, CER-513, CET-513
10	
11	eScribers
12	7227 N. 16th Street, Suite #207
13	Phoenix, AZ 85020
14	
15	Date: April 10, 2019
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	22:22;28:13;34:16,	152:21	ago (14)	10;119:10
	24;35:9,11,14;116:4	advanced (1)	36:18;43:5;47:23;	Alsup's (4)
A	actually (16)	112:4	55:5,18;65:2;67:14;	46:5,7;60:12;113:17
ability (6)	20:24;23:10;26:11,	adverse (1)	69:14;70:1;111:18;	alternatively (1)
61:19;103:17;	12,13;33:19;35:4,15;	9:14	121:19,19,19;153:11	97:6
104:23;105:17;117:16;	48:15;52:16;65:23;	advice (1)	agree (8)	alternatives (1)
124:13	86:25;95:12;101:2,11;	141:17	59:13;64:8;71:6;	139:12
able (5)	153:9	advised (1)	84:15;102:10;113:22,	although (2)
14:15;23:5;26:16,19;	ad (4)	88:25	24;135:10	51:18;149:16
71:16	30:6;90:14;122:1,3	advisor (3)	Agreed (7)	always (5)
above (3)	add (1) 61:11	33:23;89:21;111:24 advisors (8)	12:9,9;94:15;111:20; 112:22;113:7;123:4	10:9;99:13;102:2; 105:13;130:11
41:14;52:3,13	adding (1)	61:20;65:4;87:21;	agreeing (1)	ameliorate (1)
above-target (1)	30:23	109:10;111:16,17;	137:10	136:3
31:8 absent (1)	addition (1)	121:15;136:18	agreement (17)	amendments (1)
97:15	111:2	advocacy (1)	12:25;93:12,13,16,	95:9
absolutely (1)	additional (4)	144:1	18;94:1,7,25;95:3,11;	among (4)
108:13	15:22;84:21;89:6;	advocate (1)	96:9,10,24,25;97:21,	44:6;100:3;114:3;
absorb (3)	112:25	129:25	24;99:6	115:12
42:2;54:22;125:3	additive (1)	advocating (1)	agrees (1)	amount (5)
academic (1)	30:24	137:14	89:5	57:22,24;105:17;
98:5	address (20)	affairs (1) 133:15	ahead (21)	106:13;124:11
accept (6)	12:18;22:15;25:22;		7:5;8:14;29:1;30:10;	amounts (4) 30:14;81:7,8;136:14
10:20;80:1;107:17;	62:9;64:14;86:7;105:5; 110:22,23;112:7,12;	affect (1) 22:10	32:17;33:2;34:21; 38:21;41:9;70:17;	ample (1)
111:11;124:22;127:19	114:10,12;115:11;	affects (2)	73:12;78:2,4,17,17;	18:4
accomplish (2)	119:22,22;124:1;	45:1;49:24	79:7,10,11,12;116:24;	analysis (3)
81:14,16 according (6)	132:25;133:22;135:13	afforded (2)	129:14	37:21;88:16;127:24
59:16;93:15;97:19;	addressed (2)	99:7;115:5	akin (2)	analytical (1)
100:6;130:19;138:7	8:20;124:3	afternoon (3)	43:9;90:14	40:10
account (3)	addresses (3)	7:7;92:8;149:18	align (1)	anecdotally (1)
14:22;106:1;135:6	28:23;90:7,7	again (95)	29:9	134:9
accurate (2)	addressing (2)	7:9;8:10;9:7,11;	aligned (2)	announced (1)
47:17;61:1	87:18;123:6	10:4;13:18;14:3;15:11,	104:1,4	107:25
accused (1)	adequately (1) 16:22	21;16:20;18:6;24:17; 32:20;35:24;40:10,10;	AlixPartners (2) 111:16;127:25	announcing (1) 28:20
93:7	adjacent (1)	43:19;45:13,18;47:16;	allege (2)	annual (11)
achieve (18)	65:15	53:2,2;61:16;62:19;	49:1;96:15	33:21;49:12;50:4;
101:17,20;102:22; 103:12,17;104:8;	adjust (1)	66:22,25;67:14;68:1,5;	allocated (1)	94:13;99:4;102:4;
105:17,19;122:7,13,18;	96:15	70:12;79:2;80:1,13;	108:17	124:5,8,21;138:17;
125:18,19,20;126:25;	adjusted (2)	81:3,12;82:18;94:17;	allow (8)	139:4
127:2,6,8	89:20;124:9	96:5;97:20;98:16,24;	26:10;79:16;80:13,	annually (4)
achieved (1)	adjusting (2)	99:15;101:24;102:2,5,	19,20,22;81:7,19	49:17;104:9;123:21;
108:12	56:8;57:2	7,23;103:19;104:8;	allowances (1)	124:20
acknowledge (3)	adjustment (8)	105:2;106:9;108:14;	11:22	answered (2)
101:24;102:17;	12:5;84:23;89:25,25;	110:10,13;111:9;	allowed (3)	16:21;111:5
103:14	123:14,25;124:1,3 adjustments (5)	112:10,12,25;113:15; 114:3,14;115:10;	60:23;112:2;123:20 allows (1)	anticipate (1) 9:19
acknowledged (1) 106:2	61:24;89:24;123:8,	117:1;118:21;119:9,	138:1	anticipating (1)
across (5)	20;126:12	13;120:17;121:2,9,20;	almost (1)	18:19
34:16;83:14;96:11;	administered (1)	122:17;123:5,8,11;	90:17	antithesis (1)
98:5;99:13	67:12	124:1;127:21;128:12;	alone (1)	37:16
act (1)	administrative (3)	129:4,7,17;133:24;	132:9	anymore (4)
10:5	43:3;97:4;98:2	135:22;136:14;138:18,	along (6)	7:11,18;48:3;65:12
action (2)	admission (3)	23;139:11;141:22;	18:5;47:3;97:9;	apparently (1)
9:4,13	58:18;86:12,12	142:9,16,19;147:10,15;	98:10,10;144:24	54:1
actions (3)	admit (1)	149:20;152:1,24	Alsup (25)	appear (2)
79:16,16;83:13	140:3	against (3)	43:21,23,23;46:20; 47:25;48:7;51:10;	72:15;126:15
	admitted (2)	12.10.21.7.20.10		
actors (2)	admitted (2)	13:19;31:2;39:18		appearing (2)
actors (2) 91:19,20	19:5;41:21	agenda (2)	55:17,23;56:17;61:6;	27:5;92:10
actors (2) 91:19,20 acts (2)	19:5;41:21 adopted (1)	agenda (2) 7:16;12:14	55:17,23;56:17;61:6; 63:7,22;64:5;74:4;	27:5;92:10 appears (1)
actors (2) 91:19,20	19:5;41:21	agenda (2)	55:17,23;56:17;61:6;	27:5;92:10

	OMPANY			April 9, 2019
36:9,9	19:9;25:20;27:7,12,	attribute (1)	65:3;154:12	80:20;94:1;99:4;
applica (1)	14;38:21;39:6;41:1;	145:16	balance (2)	111:12;115:17;122:12;
153:9	49:9,13,14,16;55:8;	attrition (2)	90:5;91:1	142:19
applicable (5)	61:18;63:20;110:21;	128:21;129:1	balancing (3)	basket (1)
109:6,7,13;131:11,	120:6;129:24;130:13;	audit (1)	114:1,2,7	62:20
109.0,7,13,131.11,	147:20;149:21	131:10	ball (3)	basketball (1)
applicants (1)	arguments (10)	auditor (2)	108:1,1,2	51:23
11:23	12:21;13:19,22;15:8;	75:25;78:22	bankrupt (1)	battle (1)
application (10)	31:2;32:23;41:7;43:2;	authority (2)	70:14	44:7
7:23;8:18;9:15,16;	94:23;149:12	74:13;118:4	bankruptcies (1)	Bay (1)
11:3,13;108:16;121:4;	around (8)	authorize (1)	71:14	79:22
148:11;154:3	26:14;33:8;40:7;	8:14	Bankruptcy (43)	bear (1)
applications (2)	72:3;85:7;131:18,21;	available (5)	20:23;23:18;25:19;	21:20
10:14;153:10	151:13	26:17;81:24;105:24;	26:21;36:18;37:25;	became (1)
applied (9)	arrive (1)	111:3;151:2	42:25;43:9;48:12;	88:6
123:19;124:5,8,20,	127:25	average (3)	50:12,12,14;59:22;	become (1)
21,25;126:19;148:6;	arrived (1)	35:3,6,8	60:14,15;62:4,5,11,13;	145:22
149:24	90:4	avoid (1)	63:25;68:1,3,21,22;	becomes (2)
apply (5)	article (2)	63:17	71:7,14;72:3;77:23;	104:19,19
95:3;123:21;147:9,	43:9,10	avoided (1)	85:16,18;89:17;90:9,	begin (1)
12;152:4	aside (3)	78:6	19;96:22;99:3;102:12;	127:18
appreciate (5)	133:14;148:2;149:19	await (1)	104:23;120:18;130:1;	beginning (2)
7:19;30:9;83:18;	asphalt (1)	29:3	134:6;144:7,21;148:23	92:11;130:10
86:6;144:1	75:22	award (3)	bargain (1)	behalf (8)
approach (1)	assess (1)	123:22;126:15;147:7	37:14	11:19;27:5;69:7;
27:25	89:23	awards (5)	bargaining (14)	73:2,6;84:3;90:14;
appropriate (17)	assets (2)	101:25;126:1;147:7;	12:24;93:12,13,16,	130:21
9:4;25:18;26:1;61:9,	70:4,22	148:11;149:24	18;94:1,7;95:10;96:24,	behind (2)
11,15;89:24;103:4,10,	assignment (3)	aware (13)	25;97:21,24;98:15;	61:17;115:25
21;104:7;109:2;114:2,	149:23;150:6;151:20	8:3;11:23;45:18;	99:5	belabor (1) 85:22
7,17,20;120:19 appropriately (3)	assist (1) 88:8	54:11,13,14,15;66:4; 74:8;78:12;84:23;85:1;	barking (1) 65:11	believes (3)
67:12;91:1;129:11	assistant (1)	130:17	barn (1)	67:8;90:5;115:11
approval (7)	66:14	away (7)	138:14	belongs (1)
9:21;95:23;96:22;	associated (1)	37:24;52:18;60:17;	bars (2)	37:19
97:25;99:18;100:3;	91:22	85:8,20;94:13;115:14	34:12,16	below (5)
117:17	assume (5)		base (18)	29:21;41:14,23;
approve (13)	8:1;22:19;42:9;	В	30:11,12;58:25;	134:5,11
63:13;79:9;88:17;	119:23;151:10		59:13;68:14,17;81:13;	bench (2)
94:23;96:23;97:20,23;	assuming (1)	back (31)	88:2,5,18;98:24;	63:15;144:24
98:4;100:14;129:18;	142:8	15:22;36:8,17;37:13;	101:17;104:1,4;	beneficiaries (3)
142:13,18;145:4	assure (1)	49:3;51:6;60:21;62:3;	121:15;134:18;135:16;	15:19;44:16;146:3
approved (7)	115:4	67:10,14;69:22;71:20;	151:13	benefit (1)
11:2;15:20;17:13;	astounding (1)	73:22;87:11;96:12;	baseball (1)	44:15
26:18;79:18;97:7;	42:19	98:8;104:16;113:24;	136:15	benefits (3)
153:11	at-risk (1)	118:11;129:23;132:4,	based (10)	84:18;94:6;98:3
onnyog (I)				
approves (1)	29:6	17;134:1;135:12,18;	15:3;29:8;47:9;	Benvenutti (5)
88:12	attached (1)	137:7;139:4,13,14;	54:20;57:19;103:1;	8:21;9:15,24;153:15;
88:12 approving (3)	attached (1) 28:7	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5;	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1)	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1)
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4)	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1)	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4;	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3)	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1)
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3)	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7)	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15)	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1)
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22;	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12;	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5)	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22; 137:1;149:16,18;151:9	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12; 41:3;42:17;62:22;64:3;	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1)
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22;	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20 attention (1)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12;	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5) 25:20;40:4;42:18;	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6 besieged (1)
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22; 137:1;149:16,18;151:9 argue (3)	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20 attention (1) 9:3	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12; 41:3;42:17;62:22;64:3; 82:8;91:14,19,20;	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5) 25:20;40:4;42:18; 80:24;140:24	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6 besieged (1) 146:5
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22; 137:1;149:16,18;151:9 argue (3) 55:7;97:3;98:1	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20 attention (1) 9:3 attest (1)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12; 41:3;42:17;62:22;64:3; 82:8;91:14,19,20; 104:5;106:14;116:9;	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5) 25:20;40:4;42:18; 80:24;140:24 basics (1) 132:9 basing (2)	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6 besieged (1) 146:5 best (12) 33:7;67:5;68:10; 78:8;88:3;89:4,19,23;
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22; 137:1;149:16,18;151:9 argue (3) 55:7;97:3;98:1 argued (1) 100:17 arguing (2)	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20 attention (1) 9:3 attest (1) 129:2 attorney (1) 76:7	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12; 41:3;42:17;62:22;64:3; 82:8;91:14,19,20; 104:5;106:14;116:9; 145:13 baggage (1) 10:12	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5) 25:20;40:4;42:18; 80:24;140:24 basics (1) 132:9 basing (2) 42:15;150:24	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6 besieged (1) 146:5 best (12) 33:7;67:5;68:10; 78:8;88:3;89:4,19,23; 138:20;143:24;144:8;
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22; 137:1;149:16,18;151:9 argue (3) 55:7;97:3;98:1 argued (1) 100:17 arguing (2) 42:18;133:9	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20 attention (1) 9:3 attest (1) 129:2 attorney (1) 76:7 Attorney's (1)	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12; 41:3;42:17;62:22;64:3; 82:8;91:14,19,20; 104:5;106:14;116:9; 145:13 baggage (1) 10:12 Baker (6)	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5) 25:20;40:4;42:18; 80:24;140:24 basics (1) 132:9 basing (2) 42:15;150:24 basis (10)	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6 besieged (1) 146:5 best (12) 33:7;67:5;68:10; 78:8;88:3;89:4,19,23; 138:20;143:24;144:8; 148:5
88:12 approving (3) 9:23;90:25;115:19 approximately (4) 14:25;15:23;16:4; 69:7 APRIL (7) 7:1;74:5;112:22; 137:1;149:16,18;151:9 argue (3) 55:7;97:3;98:1 argued (1) 100:17 arguing (2)	attached (1) 28:7 attain (1) 23:7 attainable (1) 24:12 attempting (2) 66:22;91:20 attention (1) 9:3 attest (1) 129:2 attorney (1) 76:7	137:7;139:4,13,14; 143:16;147:18 backbone (1) 89:16 background (3) 33:18;126:1;137:9 bad (15) 15:14;27:8;40:12; 41:3;42:17;62:22;64:3; 82:8;91:14,19,20; 104:5;106:14;116:9; 145:13 baggage (1) 10:12	54:20;57:19;103:1; 108:16;124:22;126:5; 141:16 bashful (1) 130:12 basic (3) 21:10;36:17;58:25 basically (5) 25:20;40:4;42:18; 80:24;140:24 basics (1) 132:9 basing (2) 42:15;150:24	8:21;9:15,24;153:15; 154:24 Berry (1) 93:13 beside (1) 131:25 besides (1) 92:6 besieged (1) 146:5 best (12) 33:7;67:5;68:10; 78:8;88:3;89:4,19,23; 138:20;143:24;144:8;

GIIS III ID EEEE IIII C	01:11:11:11	T.		11p111 > , 2 01
29:8;98:9;99:13;	bones (1)	briefing (1)	buzzwords (1)	144:24
118:22;119:2,5;132:7;	147:13	151:24	27:11	carefully (1)
137:10;139:3;142:6,16	bonus (14)	briefs (1)	27.11	124:19
beyond (2)	32:11,24,25,25;33:1,	144:19	C	carried (1)
74:14;108:14	2,5,8,11,12;59:2;67:2;	bring (2)	0	145:1
big (6)	99:2;105:19	138:11;151:13	C-18 (1)	carry (2)
8:11;15:9;51:3;	bonuses (3)	bringing (1)	33:24	41:7;150:6
105:24;137:25;154:9	32:17;70:19;103:7	128:2	Caitlin (1)	carve (1)
bigger (1)	books (1)	brings (1)	92:9	99:14
57:25	35:22	40:6	calculated (1)	case (59)
biggest (1)	boots (1)	broad (4)	35:3	7:5;9:8;14:6;17:21;
44:12	84:17	45:1;50:20;100:12;	calculation (1)	25:19;33:24;34:25;
billion (5)	bore (1)	121:15	38:8	41:13;42:23;43:7,11;
61:12;89:11;90:18;	138:18	broader (2)	calculations (1)	44:8,25;55:11;59:21;
121:22,23	boss (2)	44:17,22	151:25	
	116:22,24	broadly (1)		60:14;62:4,5;63:6,11;
billions (2)	*	134:16	CALIFORNIA (7)	65:20;66:13;67:9;
70:4;122:2	both (6)		7:1;39:10;58:25;	68:21,22,23;69:17;
binders (1)	12:1;43:1;73:25;	broken (1)	61:5;83:14;135:9;	70:3,21,25;71:2,6,7;
7:10	123:7;139:2;144:1	33:25	137:18	72:3;100:20;102:8,12,
bit (8)	BOTTER (6)	brought (2)	Call (10)	12;109:13;114:6;
38:19;41:4;51:19;	90:13,13;91:9,11,14;	16:17;95:21	7:3,5;19:17;26:11;	120:17,24;121:1,3;
71:3;74:3;75:4;77:18;	92:5	Bruno (5)	32:25;69:2,4;129:16,	122:15;132:8;133:16;
100:2	Botter's (2)	45:22,25;46:12;	22;138:6	134:14;141:23;144:11,
blamed (2)	101:16;121:22	73:23;75:18	called (5)	13,16;145:20;146:10,
23:17,17	bottom (3)	brush (1)	17:20;37:22,23;45:4;	16,18;147:9;152:2,5
blew (1)	28:22;52:24;106:10	50:20	48:22	cases (12)
113:11	bound (1)	budget (1)	calling (1)	8:22,22;30:2;64:21;
blocked (1)	97:17	104:20	37:12	73:7;90:16;114:23;
149:15	branches (1)	build (1)	came (4)	118:12;122:6;144:17,
Bloomberg (1)	52:14	51:18	28:6;39:5;52:22;	18,25
43:10	brand (1)	buildings (1)	73:10	cash (1)
blow (1)	47:10	75:15	camp (1)	37:23
52:15	BRAY (4)	built-in (1)	73:21	catch (1)
blue (1)	87:15,16;90:11;	61:23	campfire (5)	34:2
34:16	122:4	bullet (1)	29:11,15,16;79:25;	categories (1)
blues (1)	Bray's (1)	30:7	138:16	85:10
36:8	129:8	bunch (2)	can (61)	category (3)
blunt (1)	breach (4)	52:10;80:10	7:17;19:9;26:23;	13:21;92:13;93:10
72:5	96:16;97:21,25;98:1	burden (9)	29:22;33:4;37:1,8,10;	cause (4)
board (22)	breached (1)	10:16;20:6;21:21,22;	39:24;43:18;44:7,12;	29:16;138:10,10,11
17:5,6,7,13;28:23;	97:1	23:11;25:23;132:1;	45:2;46:14;49:9;52:13;	caused (2)
34:16;96:11;98:5,8;	break (9)	133:13,13	53:12;54:25,25;56:1,	39:9;73:22
99:13;100:3,5,7,10,21;	53:10;69:4;72:14;	burdens (2)	17;65:24;66:24;67:11,	causing (1)
102:1,2,6;103:11;	73:12;84:1;86:19;	9:12;133:14	17;68:4;71:5;73:13;	63:19
104:10;135:12;147:23	141:18;143:15;147:5	burned (3)	74:7;82:11;83:9;86:21;	CEO (19)
boards (1)	breakers (1)	65:6,16;66:16	99:13;102:17;108:2,6,	28:13,19,22;32:7;
17:9	50:22	burning (1)	9,20,20,22;109:1;	33:13;58:17;64:13,19;
boards' (1)	breaking (1)	61:6	114:10,11;115:4;	66:8;67:1,4;82:24;
131:9	20:15	business (33)	120:5;123:24;128:15;	86:11;100:6,10,22,23;
Bob (1)	breaks (1)	19:17;26:5;29:19;	134:1;138:16;140:9;	116:6;136:10
48:5	53:8	42:13;63:9,13;86:13,	146:24;147:15;148:5,	certain (8)
body (2)	brick (1)	14;100:13;102:21;	10;149:5,17;150:3,13,	47:6;59:8;62:15;
45:1;104:6	65:9	103:11,15,16;109:8,8,	24;151:13;152:16	75:7;91:19;111:21;
bog (1)	bridge (2)	17,22;114:16;120:19;	cap (2)	112:11;113:2
16:20	9:5;52:19	121:5,12;122:12;	108:21,25	certainly (6)
bogey (1)	brief (15)	138:25;139:9,20;	capacity (1)	10:18;17:3;23:20;
106:3	12:16;30:6;33:9;	141:24,25;144:19,25;	17:15	63:6;141:13;145:21
Boken (1)	39:8;40:10,23;42:18;	145:4,7;149:5;151:24	capital (1)	certainty (1)
111:17	69:10;73:12;84:10;	Butte (5)	10:11	103:17
bondholders (1)	121:7;135:16;142:25;	48:12;79:15,18;	care (4)	certify (1)
136:7	148:25;150:16	82:17;83:17	8:17;10:15;86:22;	55:23
bone (1)	briefed (2)	buy (1)	150:20	cetera (1)
25:3	17:22;30:6	40:6	career (1)	144:20
	<u> </u>			

chairman (1)	119:16;120:24;144:11,	clients' (4)	132:12;136:8,11;	109:17;112:4;114:4,
117:20	12;146:4	69:13;71:2;72:7,11	140:22;141:10;145:15	20;115:6,14;121:14;
challenges (1)	cited (5)	client's (1)	committees (5)	122:19;131:11;134:6;
17:23	39:8;109:14;121:2,7;	151:21	8:14;22:24;90:20;	140:21;145:15;148:22;
chambers (1)	144:18	close (1)	123:14;131:10	152:4
7:13	City (3)	87:16	committee's (9)	competence (1) 149:7
change (13)	73:2;84:3,5	closer (2)	8:6,7,16;27:14;	, .,
16:23;50:9,12;56:22, 23;60:23;97:8;100:4,	claim (17) 12:21;27:2;43:3;	86:4;146:17 closing (1)	90:24;91:5;124:2; 130:24;145:17	competently (1) 149:6
21,22;103:1;112:24;	96:25;103:7;117:2,4,	144:23	common (1)	competitive (3)
139:8	10,11,12,13,14,15,15,	clue (2)	88:13	103:18;114:20;115:6
changed (8)	15,17;136:14	100:2;110:17	commonsense (1)	complain (2)
34:5;50:16;56:6;	claimants (12)	clueless (1)	38:24	60:6;151:16
100:19;123:20;126:12;	27:6;29:2;32:18;	152:4	communication (1)	complaining (1)
127:16;153:24	69:10;102:18;103:3,4;	Code (3)	111:23	132:13
changes (13)	114:22;115:21,21;	20:23;120:19;144:8	communities (1)	complete (2)
9:3;28:21;30:5;	122:1,8	Code's (1)	69:16	65:7;139:18
90:25;91:1,5;94:12;	claimants' (6)	26:22	companies (3)	completely (2)
95:18,21;97:9;101:24;	8:7,16;11:7;74:1;	cogent (1)	50:13;91:12;137:18	134:1;147:11
112:11;123:4	84:5;121:24	41:7	companies' (2)	completes (1)
changing (3)	claimant's (1)	colleagues (1)	131:8,9	113:1
94:12,14;123:6	130:22	111:8	company (64)	complexity (1)
Chapter (9)	claims (10)	collective (15)	17:8;21:3;23:16;	146:24
9:22;29:4,20;42:23;	29:14;71:8;88:20;	12:24;90:17;93:12,	26:6,15;31:8;32:17;	complicated (1)
90:20;104:25;114:6;	89:11;121:22,23,23,24;	13,16,18,25;94:7;	36:18;38:24;44:21;	130:3
115:17;130:3	122:2;133:3	95:10;96:24,25;97:21,	59:21;60:19;67:25;	complied (2)
charge (1)	clarification (1)	24;98:15;99:5	68:2;70:14,15;71:9,16;	121:7;145:1
19:14 charged (3)	149:14 clarified (1)	colloquy (1) 121:18	77:1;80:11;85:15; 87:20;88:1,3,4,11,15,	comply (3) 74:10,11;113:19
91:16,17,18	99:19	column (1)	18;89:3,16,17,18,22;	component (2)
chart (7)	clarifies (2)	107:15	90:6,7;91:20;99:7;	15:11;36:19
34:24;39:15,17;	9:20;154:18	comfortable (1)	101:9,18,23;102:23;	comprehend (1)
59:19,24;107:16;	clarify (1)	149:5	103:15,22;104:1;	93:17
110:18	83:19	coming (4)	105:9,10;107:3,6;	comprehensive (1)
charts (2)	class (3)	14:14;49:5;77:8;	109:5,12;113:9,15,16,	7:10
27:16;105:23	88:3;89:4,19	106:18	18;115:8;122:13;	compromise (1)
check (1)	claw (1)	commendations (1)	129:2;130:23;134:7,8,	127:25
43:12	113:24	81:16	11;138:1;143:12;146:1	concept (2)
chief (2)	clawback (1)	comment (3)	company's (5)	62:15;152:1
11:3;117:20	113:14	8:20;51:18;145:10	90:8;101:20;104:22;	concern (4)
chimney (1)	clear (12)	comments (7)	112:17;115:16	22:16;60:8;61:25;
65:9	15:16;22:16;23:7;	62:13;68:9;73:11,24;	companywide (1)	124:2
choices (1)	25:8;31:24;47:15;88:6;	74:16;144:23;153:14	25:13	concerned (3)
98:11	111:4;113:1;120:17;	commission (1)	comparable (2)	42:15;134:15,16
choose (2)	143:10,12	59:6	15:2;38:18	concerns (3)
21:5;102:15	cleared (1)	commit (2)	compare (1)	25:22;90:7;137:4
chopped (2) 55:14,14	148:7 clearing (1)	70:6;106:14 committed (2)	106:4 comparing (1)	conclude (2) 86:1;148:2
chore (1)	24:11	16:24;89:3	137:17	concluded (3)
7:8	clearly (5)	committee (63)	compensate (2)	87:23;88:25;155:2
chose (1)	22:9;96:12;112:18;	8:12;11:7,19;12:22;	40:5;67:20	conclusion (6)
21:11	145:25;149:8	17:4,15;18:14;27:2,6;	compensated (4)	32:13;34:1;68:15;
Chris (1)	CLERK (7)	54:1,10;56:6;60:5;	12:23;41:14;62:18,	89:19;135:15;141:2
69:6	7:4,6;10:8,15,17;	64:25;65:5,6,14;66:18;	18	conclusory (1)
Chronicle (1)	87:9;143:19	67:6;73:6;74:1;81:9,	compensating (1)	20:12
75:20	Clerk's (1)	25;84:5,20;86:10;87:1,	88:8	conditioned (1)
circuit (1)	11:2	14,17,21;88:6,23,25;	compensation (38)	33:10
50:22	client (3)	89:3,5,7;90:5,15;95:9;	11:14,15,17,22,24;	conditions (4)
circumstance (1)	98:6,9;101:16	101:15;102:6;103:20;	17:4,15;29:6;33:10;	74:9;79:12,13;95:3
90:3	clients (10)	105:22;111:1,15,23;	37:16;58:2,6;59:1,12,	conduct (1)
circumstances (12)	64:22;66:12,17;70:7,	113:8;114:4;121:14,	13,15;64:17;69:15;	63:21
9:2,17;10:23;24:16;	18;94:24;96:4,14;	21,24;122:1,3,24;	93:12;98:24;99:1;	confident (1)
25:19;59:9;112:19;	121:22;129:8	124:9;130:22;131:11;	102:5;103:18;105:18;	149:10
-		1	1	l

confidential (3) 22:23:111:12:123:1 confirmation (1) 104:24 conflict (1) 41:4 conflicts (5) 9:8,10;27:10;144:19; 145:14 confused (4) 125:2;132:10; 148:18,19 confusing (1) 125:24 connection (1) 153:12 conscience (1) 32:8 conscientiously (1) 58:12 consent (1) 8:12 consider (2) 78:10:151:1 consideration (1) 141:8 considered (1) 121:14 Considering (2) 29:23:130:9 consistent (13) 8:15:9:7.24:10:5: 30:19,22;37:9;85:12; 105:14;111:9;112:11. 17;113:6 constituency (3) 89:18:102:14:103:1 consultant (3) 139:21;140:1,1 consultants (1) 33:8 consulting (1) 140:23 contained (1) 22:14 contemplated (1) 102:20 contemplating (1) 16:16 contend (1) 36:14 context (2) 59:25;144:20 contingent (1) 96:22 continuance (1) 147:16 continuation (1) 101:23 continue (2) 112:23;119:12 continued (3) 91:18;147:25;148:19

continuing (1) 61:2 contract (6) 13:10;97:5,18,19; 98:25;135:14 contracts (2) 89:13;146:22 contractual (1) 98:24 contractually (1) 98:2 contrary (2) 121:9;145:25 contrast (1) 111:14 control (2) 21:24;22:9 convenience (1) 86:20 conversation (1) 130:3 convict (1) 48:14 convicted (2) 48:11.17 conviction (7) 44:4,5;45:20;46:4; 48:22,23,24 convictions (2) 46:6;48:11 convince (1) 44:10 convinced (4) 31:20;43:19,20; 135:24 cooperate (1) 151:16 **cope** (1) 23:18 copies (2) 7:13;28:2 **copy** (2) 27:18;74:7 Corp (1) 36:18 corporate (2) 64:20;65:17 Corporation (3) 7:4,6;130:23 corrected (1) 16:8 corrections (1) 61:24 correctly (5) 9:16;13:17;48:10; 68:7;127:13 cost (1) 99:4 couched (1) 118:14 coughing (1) 143:24 counsel (18)

8:11;9:22;11:6;19:8; 69:2:70:17:72:15: 78:11;87:1,16;121:18; 130:22.24:134:3: 145:12,17;148:25; 149:9 counterparties (2) 89:9;146:22 country (1) 135:4 County (5) 53:19;73:2;79:15,18; 84:3 couple (8) 8:1;12:17;65:8; 73:24;74:16;102:13; 105:5;147:20 course (6) 11:14;37:1;44:2; 90:4;121:5;135:10 **Court (542)** 7:3,5,7,21,25;8:4,10; 9:21;10:2,19;11:11; 12:4,6,10,12,12;13:7, 15;14:17,19,24;15:5,7, 25;16:2,5,7,11,14,17, 20;17:10,12,17;18:9, 12,18,19,21,24;19:3,7, 12,20;20:3,8,15,19; 21:4,8,14,17,19,23; 22:3,19,21;23:14;24:2, 17,25;25:6,10,16,25; 26:2,8,23,25;27:2,7,10, 15,17,20,23,25;28:1,3, 9,15;30:16,22,25; 31:10,13,21;32:1,10, 14,20,22;33:4,17;34:2, 7,11,13,15,19;35:8,11, 14,19,21;36:4,7,13,15, 25;37:3,6,17,20,25; 38:7,11,14,16,21; 39:16,20,22;40:9,16, 21,25;41:6,15,18,24; 42:7,9,24;43:4,4,7,11, 12,13,25;44:2,9;45:17; 46:1,4,16,19,24;48:14, 16,19,21,24;49:11,21; 50:1,6,10;51:1,4,8,10, 15,22,25;52:21;53:3,5, 11,19,22,24;54:4,6,8, 13,17,21;55:8,12;56:8, 12,21,24;57:6,10,12, 14,25;58:9,16,20,22; 59:5,18;60:3,9,11,15; 61:16;62:1,7,14,22; 63:3,15;64:7;65:1,22; 66:1,2,4;67:13;68:16, 25;69:2,8,20;70:9,12; 71:5;72:5,12,14,20,24; 73:4,8,16,18,20;74:2,6, 18,22,25;75:13;76:6,8, 11,14,17,20,23;77:3,5, 7,10,13,15,17,21,25;

78:2,4,7,10,13,15,25; 79:2.7.8.18.21.23:80:1. 5,8,10,17,18,21,24; 81:1,3,5,6,10,23;82:5, 7,13,18,20,22;83:1,5,7, 9,18,22,24;84:7,9,23; 85:3,5,7,15,25;86:3,7, 16,18;87:10;88:12,24; 90:11;91:6,10,13;92:4, 6,15,17,20;93:17,22, 24;94:3,9,17,21;95:2,7, 14,16,19,25;96:3,8,11, 17,20,22;97:2,6,14,16, 20,22,25;98:4,13,22; 99:8,11,18,22,24; 100:9;101:6,8,13; 102:7,11,24;104:12,14; 105:7,12,15,21;106:2, 9,19,21;107:1,3,7,9,11, 13;108:8,10,19,23,25; 109:15,19;110:6,9,12, 15,21;111:25;112:2,9, 13;113:5,9,13,16,21, 25;115:2,9,23;116:15, 19,21,24;117:3,5,10, 13,17,18,25;118:2,3,5, 7,11,18,19;119:11,13, 15,17,21;120:3,5,9,13, 15,21,25;122:21; 123:10,17,22;124:4,8, 15,17;125:1,8,10,16, 24;126:7,20,22;127:2, 5,9,11,14,23;128:6,8, 10,12,17,19,22,24; 129:3,6,13,19;130:1,8, 11;131:4,6,15,18,21, 24;132:10,16,22;133:9, 12,14,23;135:2,10; 136:4,6,12,24;137:2, 16,23;138:2,4,18,23; 140:6,18,20;141:1,12, 18,21;142:7,10,13,15, 17,21,24;143:3,7,9,14, 20;150:12,16,19,22; 151:1,5,7,11,19,23; 152:7,11,13,15,21,24; 153:2,5,7,18,23;154:3, 7,9,12,15,17,21,23; 155:1 court-appointed (1) 73:6 CourtCall (1) 86:22 courtroom (1) 86:23 Court's (1) 11:13 cover (1) 16:10 covered (5)

CPUC (13) 29:17;74:11;75:2,4; 76:1;78:14,20;79:11; 81:22:112:18:113:1. 11;119:9 cracks (1) 66:24 Cravath (2) 130:17,21 crawling (2) 111:18;123:2 crazy (2) 52:14;65:11 created (2) 29:18;39:1 creates (2) 52:19;63:25 creating (1) 74:15 credit (1) 29:19 creditor (3) 81:9;103:1;104:6 creditors (17) 24:2;29:2;44:24; 67:21,22;71:11,17; 88:20;89:15;91:25; 92:1;101:1;102:14,15; 115:18;129:8;146:21 creditors' (18) 8:6,12:54:1,10:56:6; 84:20;87:1,17;90:24; 95:9;101:15;111:15; 113:8;121:21;123:14; 124:2;136:8;141:10 criminal (6) 46:8;77:22;79:14,15, 16:146:23 critical (7) 19:13;88:14;89:17, 18;101:19;103:13,16 criticisms (1) 146:5 criticize (1) 136:7 cross (1) 9:5 cross-(2) 150:14,24 cross-examination (1) 18:16 cross-examine (3) 140:9;149:1;150:17 crystal (3) 108:1,1,2 culpable (2) 50:2;145:24 culture (1) 52:8 current (5) 14:11;77:17;96:5,6,8 31:7;46:11,11;89:11; cow (1) 97:4 138:14 currently (1)

dealing (6)

12:14;23:16;38:1;

44:23;77:1;98:20

GAS AND ELECTRIC
29:3
cusp (1)
22:5
customary (6)
101:4;114:19;
115:13;116:14,15;
118:22
customer (3)
85:9;90:2;102:25
cut (2)
40:8;82:22
cutting (4)
48:3;52:12,14;91:17
cynical (2)
106:9,10
D
James (1)
damage (1)
60:1
damaged (1)
75:15
damages (1)
98:1

106:9,10
D
damage (1)
60:1
damaged (1)
75:15 damages (1)
98:1
Dana (2)
121:6,8
dangle (1)
150:2
Dario (1)
73:17
data (2) 135:6,7
date (4)
100:5;116:4;150:8;
151:8
date's (1)
151:7
David (1)
90:13 day (13)
41:8;43:8;48:11;
55:14;65:3,5;66:19,23;
71:9,14;72:8;146:5;
149:19
Day-by-day (1)
66:21
Dayna (1) 23:8
23:8 days (6)
42:1;54:23;77:13;
78:19;95:25;143:13
day-to-day (1)
109:11
dead (1)
52:24 deadline (1)
71:18
deal (15)
0.11.14.2.20.11

death (3)
83:13;134:21;138:19
debate (1)
41:2
debilitate (1)
63:11
debt (2)
89:10;90:17
debtor (40)
10:15;12:20;13:1;
17:19,19;22:11;25:23;
26:16;27:20;53:15;
60:16;64:2;65:17;70:2;
81:24;88:25;89:21;
92:6;95:2,8,17;97:6,8,
11,17,23,25;98:6,8;
99:12,17;124:9;
144:11;145:8;147:16; 148:20;149:4,20;
148:20;149:4,20;
150:15;154:19
debtor-in-possession (1)
145:2
debtors (14)
15:18;16:16;20:6,23;
21:20;23:2;24:14;
26:22;90:20;94:10,11;
99:18;119:9;153:10
debtors' (6)
67:19;70:16;87:13;
98:17;121:12;136:19
debtor's (6)
8:5;13:11;18:4;
23:11;86:24;148:3
debtors-in-possession (1)
9:22
December (4)
33:6;46:2;47:1;75:2
decide (9)
26:4;67:24;96:14;
97:8;98:4,5,7;99:13;
136:20
decided (2)
28:24;136:19
decision (10)
23:14;49:23;109:10;
110:1,8;111:20;
138:20,21;142:25;
145:2
decisions (4)
22:10;109:9;110:14;
141:25
declarants (5)
18:16,17;19:13;20:8;
111:2
declaration (12)
17:3;22:15;28:8;
41:12;93:6,14;120:1,7;
132:2;152:9,19,21
declarations (2)
19:5;132:3
,
a
Doo# 1225 FifS

decrease (1)
91:22
decree (2) 44:14;67:15
default (1)
153:13 defer (2)
14:1;144:24
deference (1)
109:8 definition (4)
20:22;26:22;64:12;
120:2
definitions (1) 25:2
DEGHETALDI (57)
72:19;73:15,17,17; 74:9 20 24:75:1:76:10
74:9,20,24;75:1;76:10 13,16,18,22,25;77:4,6
8,11,16,20,24;78:1,3,5
9,11,14,18;79:1,5,8,20 22,24;80:4,7,9,15,18,
25;81:2,4,6,16;82:4,6
12,15,19,21,25;83:2,6 8,11,20,23
degree (1)
112:4
delay (3) 87:10;143:6,11
delays (1)
146:16
demand (1) 140:10
demanded (1)
95:22 demonstrate (2)
21:21;23:12
demonstrated (2)
24:15;75:6 demonstrating (1)
25:23
demonstrative (3) 27:16;33:20;105:9
denied (1)
63:16
denigrate (1) 61:4
Dennis (1)
48:6 deny (10)
14:1;26:6,8;72:6;
114:14,18;133:25;
135:12;144:4,14 denying (3)
63:17;83:13;85:13
departed (1)
17:18 depend (1)
146:12

	depose (2)
	140:25;147:23 deposed (2)
	132:13;150:18
	deposition (16)
	21:5,9;41:21;54:19,
	24;75:25;78:23;82:17
	83:15;111:3,7;134:4,
	14;139:19,22;151:15 depositions (7)
	19:3;42:1,3;43:21;
	132:3;139:15;151:10
	depriving (1)
	122:17
	derivative (1)
	41:4 describe (1)
10,	111:16
1,6,	described (1)
3,5,	68:6
20,	deserve (2)
8, ,6,	63:13;64:17 designed (1)
,0, 2,6,	29:7
2,0,	desire (3)
	8:6;10:1;88:21
	despite (3)
	70:3,5;106:12 destroyed (1)
	29:12
	destroys (1)
	31:9
	destruction (3)
	60:20;83:14;134:21 detail (3)
	22:22;61:17;76:14
	details (2)
	19:15;139:14
	deter (1)
	40:25 determination (3)
	9:1;26:19;46:10
	determine (1)
	24:22
	determined (1) 108:17
	deterred (1)
	63:23
	detrimental (1)
	114:21
	devastation (1) 65:7
	develop (1)
	9:2
	Diego (3)
	134:22,25;140:3
	difference (3)
	11:24;49:17;125:4 different (19)
	10:24;13:16,21;
	37:23;49:15;50:15;
	66:10,12;67:22;72:9;
	79:21;92:13;93:10;

94:4;100:20,21; 107:23;125:6;134:1 differently (4) 13:23;14:3;102:16; 107:16 difficult (12) 17; 10:13,20;23:8;26:12; 41:25;68:3;126:25; 5 127:2,6,8,15;144:3 dig (1) 143:5 dilemma (1) 63:25 **DIP** (1) 88:17 directed (2) 84:11;90:22 directly (1) 134:10 director (1) 56:17 directors (1) 17:7 disadvantaged (1) 146:15 disagree (6) 38:5;58:14,14;59:16; 101:11;139:20 disapprove (4) 96:8,11;98:5;136:24 disasters (1) 73:22 disclosed (4) 23:1;31:19;81:8; 137:13 disclosure (4) 23:3;80:22;100:15; 148:13 discount (3) 90:2;135:6;136:13 discounting (1) 145:11 discover (1) 140:11 discovery (2) 139:15;149:3 discrepancy (1) 105:24 discretion (7) 23:20;26:4;104:9,10, 14,15,16 discretionary (2) 59:7;102:1 discuss (2) 30:13;43:16 discussed (3) 100:1;114:3,4 discussing (1) 28:12 discussion (3) 87:19;118:25;150:9 9: discussions (3)

8:11;14:2;28:11;

144:3;154:9

40:12;54:10;67:17;

78:25;79:5,6;80:11;

106:15;131:2;139:7;

depending (1)

36:10;59:10

108:11

depends (2)

13:3;131:8;140:11

-		I		
disinterested (2)	138:8;143:1;148:10;	52:18	68:17;146:24	145:15
8:24;9:9	151:3,16,17	eats (1)	email (11)	enforcement (3)
disinterestedness (1)	door (5)	52:17	28:13,19,22;29:21;	75:3,5,24
153:17	49:7;53:6;57:20,21;	economic (1)	58:18;64:15;86:10;	engaged (1)
disorganized (1)	134:3	122:13	103:25;130:19,20,22	47:12
143:23	double (4)	Edison (1)	emergence (1)	engagement (2)
dispositive (1)	40:4;89:13;106:13,	134:24	115:17	134:10;154:5
144:21	17	educate (3)	emotions (1)	enhance (1)
dispute (1)	down (21)	147:18;149:23;	68:6	44:21
13:9	14:14;16:20;29:21;	151:21	emphasize (2)	enhances (1)
disqualifying (1)	33:11;34:7;40:6;47:18;	Edward (2)	128:1,2	88:19
145:14	57:18;58:25;62:8;65:7,	72:25;84:2	emphatic (1)	e-note (1)
disregard (1)	15,16;66:16;91:17;	effect (4)	32:24	131:16
136:19	106:16;123:7,8,8,24;	28:25;85:14;115:1,	employed (6)	enough (8)
disregarding (1)	151:19	22	10:8,12;11:20;15:18;	56:24;63:9,10,12;
145:11	downgrades (1)	effective (3)	58:2;88:16	128:1,3;133:20;142:22
disrespectful (1)	29:20	100:5;139:12,13	employee (21)	ensure (2)
110:10	downward (7)	effectively (1)	16:16;41:19;42:16;	88:2,3
disrupted (1)	56:9;84:24;89:25;	101:22	57:18;78:22;82:8,8;	entered (2)
29:14	123:25;124:1,3,24	efficiently (1)	88:2,5,18;101:17;	74:5;91:5
distinguished (1)	dozen (1)	21:25	104:1,4;111:11,11,12;	enterprise (1)
17:7	39:9	effort (3)	112:4;115:13;145:21;	129:10
distribution (2)	draft (1)	13:11;100:25;136:17	148:22;152:4	entire (2)
122:15,16	61:20	egregious (1)	employees (75)	72:6;104:6
District (4)	dramatically (1)	57:17	14:7,10,11,25;16:13,	entirely (1)
11:16;37:25;48:13;	100:19	eight (3)	19;28:20;31:1,3;32:21;	114:12
66:16	drawing (2)	121:22;131:7;132:11	36:1;40:1;41:13,17,20;	entitled (8)
dividends (4)	98:8;135:12	eighteen (2)	42:5,16;45:5,6;47:7;	12:23;13:10;33:21;
38:1;85:13,16,18	drink (1)	36:18;50:11	49:20,24;52:6;55:17;	97:4;98:1;115:13;
division (2)	143:24	eighty (1)	58:1;59:19;64:17;	122:15;150:3
75:4,24	driven (1)	58:12	67:10,24;71:23;79:3;	entry (2)
division's (1)	71:7	eighty-five (1)	81:25;87:25;88:7,14,	90:25;153:13
75:5	due (1)	58:3	14;89:8;92:12,14,21,	environment (2)
DOA (1)	134:8	eighty-six (3)	24,24;93:2,3,11,14;	46:11;50:15
132:8	duplication (1)	29:11;31:16,17	94:5;95:13;98:20,21;	environmental (1)
docket (3) 7:17;12:16;70:25	19:14 during (4)	either (9) 9:2,2;12:21;20:6;	99:9;102:22;103:12, 17;109:3;114:14;	146:23
document (5)	19:1;47:1;131:11;	36:8;37:24;67:7;86:21;	115:5,24;117:16,21;	equally (2) 8:7;89:18
27:15;31:11;130:15;	148:3	98:9	119:4;122:12,18;	equipment (5)
139:16;151:15	duties (1)	electric (4)	128:5;134:2,17,25;	29:18;31:9,16;39:9;
documents (8)	111:12	112:14;130:23;	135:13;138:11;141:6;	53:7
111:6;130:25;	duty (3)	134:22,25	146:1,3,15,25;150:2	equity (15)
140:21,22,24;141:13;	90:20;91:3,12	electrical (3)	employee's (1)	15:10,12;32:8;36:19,
150:23;151:1	70.20,71.3,12	46:23;78:21,24	58:6	21;37:8,13,14,15,22,
dog (1)	\mathbf{E}	eleven (1)	employer (1)	24;38:9;59:20;106:11;
65:11		65:4	59:1	122:3
dollar (5)	earlier (7)	eligible (1)	enable (1)	equity-based (1)
30:14;57:22;61:9;	54:21;90:16,19;	93:14	104:7	36:2
72:7;136:14	106:13;118:24;119:18;	eliminate (1)	enabled (1)	equity-type (1)
dollars (22)	153:11	75:9	123:3	37:15
15:3;35:7;37:11;	earliest (1)	eliminated (1)	encapsulates (1)	equivalents (1)
44:24;65:20;70:4;	80:21	114:12	66:13	90:1
81:13;89:12;90:18;	early (2)	else (22)	encompass (1)	erased (1)
104:20;106:7,23;	62:5;88:21	8:2;12:12,19;16:24;	16:18	66:25
107:17;108:7,15;	easier (2)	28:5;31:11;45:19;	encourage (1)	ESC (4)
121:22,23;122:2;	24:8;127:7	50:23;54:25;69:4;	151:15	92:10,12,22;99:9
136:14,16,16;138:13	easily (3)	72:21;74:6;86:16;87:3;	encouraging (1)	escape (1)
done (22)	24:12;69:16;133:7	92:6;100:1;113:11;	136:2	144:16
9:13;10:1;22:22;	easy (10)	122:24;129:17;138:9;	end (9)	ESP (2)
23:4;35:3;49:20;62:25;	21:23,24;22:4;23:7;	140:18;148:9	43:23;53:9;57:17;	97:8;99:14
65:19;68:19;84:22;	25:16;39:23;101:3;	else's (1)	64:14;77:8;80:21;	especially (1)
93:5;103:22,23;	127:20;130:6,8	89:2	124:17;139:18;151:20	55:17
108:14;127:21;133:17;	eating (1)	elsewhere (2)	endorsed (1)	essence (1)

GIIS III ID EEEE TRIC C	T			119111 > , 201>
133:8	130:25;150:15	50:14;76:20	factors (6)	faulting (1)
essential (1)	examine (2)	experts (4)	57:3;112:16;121:6,8;	128:13
122:5	147:23;150:25	54:24;110:17;	136:20;137:19	fear (1)
essentially (12)	example (2)	148:21;149:7	facts (6)	62:16
17:11;20:5;33:8;	26:17;52:9	explain (13)	24:15;25:18;54:24;	feasible (1)
57:21;60:6;70:5;84:17;	excavate (1)	123:10,16;125:2,8;	107:19;120:23;152:1	104:25
90:1;110:24;121:3;	75:22	137:7;139:13;140:7,8,	factual (1)	features (1)
141:4;149:4	excavation (1)	24;141:14;144:5;	74:1	61:23
establish (2)	75:11	148:5,20	fail (1)	February (5)
120:7,11	exceed (1)	explained (3)	20:6	28:19;62:11;75:13;
estate (1)	89:11	127:12;137:3;144:22	failing (1)	115:24;136:10
121:5	exceedingly (1) 115:11	explaining (5) 30:4;74:21;123:13;	48:12 fails (3)	feel (2) 147:2,2
estates (1) 90:24	except (4)	148:6;149:21	97:23;113:9,15	feet (1)
Estela (1)	28:18;97:12;102:13;	explains (2)	failure (3)	52:13
73:5	110:19	28:13;30:5	75:8;95:6;128:3	Feld (1)
et (1)	excess (3)	explanation (2)	fair (4)	90:14
144:20	70:4,23;121:21	100:16;127:19	13:5;108:15;129:11;	fellow (1)
evaluate (1)	exchange (1)	explosion (4)	146:8	140:16
132:24	37:15	73:23;75:14,19;	faith (4)	few (5)
evaluating (1)	excised (1)	76:15	27:8;41:3;42:17;	74:1;77:13;78:19;
17:16	82:11	exposure (1)	145:13	101:23;111:17
even (38)	exclude (2)	89:12	fall (3)	fi (1)
11:19;18:21;21:2;	18:1;86:25	expressing (1)	13:21;20:22;24:13	113:1
22:15;23:13;24:13,20;	excluded (1)	62:17	falls (1)	field (2)
25:14,16;31:9;32:7;	21:15	extend (3)	96:23	50:21;148:22
34:7;38:23;40:5;42:4;	excluding (1)	74:14;76:1;78:20	falsification (12)	fifteen (3)
47:11;50:13,13;52:5;	18:1	extensively (1)	45:7,20,22;46:10,21;	58:6,9;87:7
54:11,23;55:3;57:25;	excuse (4)	146:12	47:2,13,24;49:19;75:7,	fifteen-minute (1)
59:24;61:10;62:10,24;	8:18,23;76:2;86:25	extent (3)	8,9	86:19
67:3;70:14;75:9;84:22;	executed (2)	19:12;103:20;147:4	falsifications (3)	fifth (2)
100:5;113:7;121:5;	145:8;149:6	extra (1)	45:24;48:2;55:19	49:5;50:8
135:22;137:4,14;	executive (3)	150:3	falsified (3)	fifty (6)
144:14	73:6;117:21;148:22	extract (1)	45:16,17;49:20	15:1;24:11;25:12;
event (1)	executory (1)	103:21	falsify (3)	106:6;126:10;134:20
128:4	89:12	extreme (1) 41:4	47:19;49:15;53:14	fight (1) 139:3
everybody (8) 23:24;24:23;44:11;	exercise (4) 19:17;104:16;	extremely (2)	falsifying (1) 61:3	figure (7)
50:23;71:6;117:24;	120:19;145:4	108:18,20	familiar (3)	64:1;68:2,10;70:13;
138:19;147:24	Exhibit (3)	eye (1)	74:18;137:8;141:25	77:22;108:4;135:1
everyone (7)	28:10;33:24;93:14	81:15	Families (1)	file (10)
7:7,13;63:5;86:22;	exhibits (2)	01.10	29:13	64:17;69:11;71:19;
145:20;146:18;153:5	28:17;33:20	${f F}$	fan (1)	72:1;81:12;82:3,23;
everyone's (1)	exit (2)	_	51:23	90:23;91:11;116:8
86:20	89:4:90:9	face (7)	far (5)	filed (23)
evidence (28)	exits (1)	31:15;33:7;42:19;	11:3;56:3,15;134:15,	10:13;14:6;27:16;
19:5,16;24:1;32:6,6;	89:16	49:10;69:14,23,24	17	28:3,5;29:17;48:12;
41:11,12;51:20;53:21;	exodus (1)	facie (3)	farce (2)	54:14;56:2;71:4;84:6;
59:17,18;60:21;76:3;	115:6	20:9;120:7;133:16	133:7,18	87:22;90:16;98:15;
93:4;119:25;121:9,10,	expect (1)	facilitate (6)	FAs (1)	112:18;116:3;119:4,9;
11,12,17;128:6,10,12,	9:3	44:21;87:20;88:9;	38:10	131:22,23;148:15;
13,14;134:3;135:25;	expectation (1)	90:8;114:24;122:14	faster (1)	152:9;153:10
140:11	115:12	facing (3)	122:20	files (2)
exact (2)	expected (2)	29:14;134:8,21	fast-moving (1)	59:21;97:11
24:7;54:18	26:6;109:19	fact (15)	41:25	filing (3)
exactly (13)	expedite (1)	30:20;47:13;51:21;	fatalities (1)	29:20;116:4;134:6
20:18,21;21:2;22:12;	115:16	55:20;90:19;91:15;	29:12	final (2)
23:7;24:19;25:7;48:5;	expenses (1)	102:18,19;105:16;	fate (2)	11:6;17:1
52:22;53:4;113:8;	8:15	111:2;114:21,25;	15:17,17	finality (1)
114:25;120:8	experience (5)	115:21;128:20;144:16	fateful (1)	141:7
exaggerate (1)	50:25;52:9,13;70:13;	factor (4)	66:23	finally (2)
		00.10.114.10	foult (2)	22,12,24.12
53:14 examination (2)	83:12 experienced (2)	89:12;114:1,2; 128:14	fault (2) 87:11;130:16	23:13;24:13 financial (16)

GIR III ID EEECT MIC C	OMI MILL			11p111 > , 2013
33:23;56:9,19;65:4;	121:19;123:23;139:8	forth (2)	65:19,25	126:2,3;134:15
84:12,24;85:9;88:4;	fix (10)	125:4;126:2	fundamental (1)	Good (29)
89:21;90:1;91:25;	43:21;49:18;51:6,8;	fortunately (1)	42:14	7:7,7;11:9;15:13;
111:15,17,24;125:12;	52:22;55:17;61:3;	75:14	fundamentally (2)	27:4;29:9;32:8;33:15;
146:20	63:14;64:8,9	forty (3)	109:17,18	52:1;56:3;57:7,18;
find (6)	fixed (3)	25:12;43:5;139:22	further (11)	68:11,21;69:6,8;73:1,
29:10;49:7;63:2;	31:19;57:17;148:2	forty-eight (1)	13:3;18:25;62:3;	5;82:8;87:15,15;90:13;
105:8;138:14;151:8	fixing (2)	95:8	74:12;96:15;140:7,10,	92:8,9;100:24;102:20;
findings (3)	48:3;50:22	forty-five (2)	11,11;149:13;150:9	130:13;132:8;151:7
153:16,17,21	flame (1)	75:17;121:11	future (6)	governance (6)
fine (7)	75:17	forward (15)	9:2;72:8;81:20,21;	42:14;49:4;53:8;
10:16;32:15;53:15;	flesh (3) 25:2;103:21;147:12	13:9,13;14:6;24:2;	133:2,2	63:2,3;64:20
57:6;151:9,9;154:10 fines (1)	flexibility (1)	35:23;36:7;102:3; 103:4,24,25;104:2;	G	grand (3) 79:14,14;80:3
113:13	99:12	114:17;115:15,15;	G	grandstanding (2)
fine-tune (1)	flipped (1)	132:1	game (2)	64:24;65:1
51:12	56:19	foundation (2)	52:1;136:15	grant (4)
finger (2)	focus (10)	88:22;145:8	garbage (1)	13:24;26:23;99:8;
105:25;141:23	27:7;30:7;44:15;	four (11)	147:14	144:3
finish (1)	66:21;77:25;91:2,18;	17:5;42:1;49:5;	gas (8)	granular (1)
62:2	103:5;130:4;137:21	54:22;55:11;116:3,7;	45:9;75:16,18,23;	127:19
finished (1)	focused (6)	130:24;138:22;153:9,	130:23;134:22,25;	granularity (1)
62:6	63:22,23,23;103:23,	10	140:3	126:19
fire (38)	25;137:19	four-by-four (1)	gather (1)	Gray (33)
32:18;42:22;43:17,	focuses (1)	65:9	61:21	92:9,9,16,19,21;
19;44:10,12,23,25;	33:13	fourth (1)	gave (7)	93:21,23,25;94:4,10,
45:3,22;49:20;50:8;	focusing (7)	114:11	54:1;93:16;98:24;	20;95:1,5,12,15,17,21;
52:3,5;55:15;63:10,17,	32:1;49:11;137:16;	frame (1)	100:2;139:16;141:9,10	96:1,7,10,16,19,21;
19,20,24;64:4;66:12,	143:4,6,8,11	24:22	Geary (1)	97:3,13,15,17,22;
19,21,24;67:3,16;69:3,	folk (1)	FRANCISCO (4)	75:14	98:12,19,23;99:21,23
9;73:21;79:22;82:17;	76:8	7:1;50:22;73:3;84:4	Geisha (2)	great (5)
83:17;86:13,14; 113:23;136:1;145:16	folks (7) 39:1;50:24;55:15;	frankly (3) 36:16;54:25;106:17	82:16;83:15	24:12;28:11;58:18; 64:3;122:22
fires (16)	63:8;69:18;135:14;	fraud (1)	general (3) 24:10;25:4;33:24	greater (2)
39:10;44:14;49:4;	146:12	42:18	generally (5)	30:3;64:22
50:13;55:11;59:25;	follow (4)	frequently (1)	22:10;73:24;101:23;	Greek (1)
67:15,23;68:1;71:8;	12:13;32:3;43:12;	7:14	109:22;146:1	127:16
101:10;103:14;135:3,	112:24	Friday (1)	gentleman (3)	green (6)
4,5,8	following (4)	96:1	73:10,14;121:10	34:21;36:5,5,9;
firm (7)	38:23;46:7;75:3;	Friske (4)	gets (3)	38:18;47:5
8:20;9:17;11:20;	130:25	41:12,15;57:14;	52:16;81:13;138:14	Greene (1)
130:17,18,21;153:15	food (1)	132:3	Ghost (3)	84:3
firms (2)	65:24	front (11)	73:7;86:8,13	Gregory (1)
8:23,23	force (2)	29:1;43:22;47:4;	gift (2)	87:16
firms' (1)	37:22;48:7	51:20;53:21;54:7,8;	119:1,1	grid (1)
9:3	forceful (1)	55:6;59:17;65:10;	given (6)	46:23
firm's (1) 153:24	32:24 forever (1)	116:1 frustration (1)	34:1;47:9;54:2;	grievance (3) 95:5;96:15,20
first (33)	29:14	69:12	74:13;109:8;110:24 giving (4)	grinning (2)
8:19;14:20;17:21;	forget (4)	FTI (5)	16:24;37:24;38:2,3	82:13,15
18:3;19:21;28:22;31:6;	41:6;50:18;57:4;	87:22;89:22;111:15;	glad (2)	grounds (1)
34:1,23;35:25;41:10;	130:4	123:2;127:24	84:20;98:16	84:17
42:11;43:8;46:17,20;	forgot (1)	full (8)	goal (7)	group (2)
50:11;57:19;62:6;63:1;	45:23	69:25;70:3,8,20;	25:9,11,15;26:12;	69:20;115:13
65:21;71:7,7;73:13;	form (2)	71:2,17;80:22;88:20	145:20,21;151:19	groups (2)
79:10;85:19;87:5,14;	89:11,16	fully (5)	goals (3)	88:10;145:22
99:25;105:8;113:18;	former (2)	17:21;86:8;139:25;	100:25;102:22;	guaranteed (1)
130:14;135:15;144:6	82:24;92:25	145:6,6	122:13	58:19
firsthand (1)	formula (4)	function (2)	God (1)	guarantees (1)
50:24	31:23;93:15;94:4;	10:24;138:4	79:10	29:7
five (10)	97:19	functions (1)	goes (9)	guess (13)
35:11,14;44:17;	formulate (1)	84:14	36:17;47:18;52:20;	10:16;37:9;44:9;
75:22,22;81:14;116:7;	70:13	fund (2)	56:3;69:22;113:10;	49:11;57:7;96:13;98:6;
·	1	1	1	1

hat (1)

17:13

30:17

highly (4)

incentive (20)

33:12;36:11;37:5,8;

GAS AND ELECTRIC C	OMPANY			April 9, 2013
116:5,10;131:22;	hate (4)	76:20;100:4;139:2,2	97:17;101:2,11,21;	
132:19;139:6,7	106:9;146:10,12,13	Hill (1)	102:18;103:3,5,8,19;	т
guidelines (8)	Hauer (1)	69:7	102:16,103:3,3,6,17,	I
11:14,15,17,24,25;	90:14	Hills (1)	109:1,6,11,13;110:4;	.1 (2)
12:1;24:6;154:18	Hawkins (11)	52:14	111:10,14;112:16,25;	idea (3)
Gump (1)	18:15;69:6,6,8,9,22;	hinted (1)	113:22;114:24;115:4,	55:2;57:7;76:9
90:14	70:11,16;72:1,10,13	69:13	15,19;116:17;117:1,	identified (1)
guy (2)	heads (1)	hired (1)	24;118:9,24;119:7,20;	9:11
83:9;141:16	55:13	66:15	121:20;122:10,15;	identify (2) 17:4;21:23
guys (3)	head's (1)	historical (5)	128:1;129:4,18;	identifying (1)
50:21,25;87:6	55:14	24:21;35:7;39:8;	130:15;134:3;139:23;	18:2
	healthy (1)	61:13;108:16	141:22;142:9;143:2,	ignore (5)
H	88:1	historically (3)	13;150:11;152:6;	35:17;39:21;96:5;
	hear (13)	39:13;62:10;107:19	153:3,6	136:13,20
habit (1)	12:25;13:18;17:25;	history (4)	Honorable (1)	ignored (1)
83:12	18:3;27:8;59:11;64:23;	46:21;61:10;74:3;	48:6	78:6
half (2)	70:7,19;80:2;87:2;	105:10	Honor's (1)	illuminating (1)
61:12;75:16	119:18;137:20	hit (5)	62:12	28:18
hand (1)	heard (18)	32:7;70:24;85:23;	hope (10)	illustrative (1)
68:8	12:13;19:22;65:18;	107:3,6	9:4;43:23,25;44:2,3,	86:11
handed (2)	69:3,4;72:17,18;87:2,	hoc (3)	11;68:5;135:21;	imagination (2)
27:24;33:20	3;88:20;89:4;91:19;	90:14;122:1,3	145:20;148:18	108:14;112:19
handing (1)	110:15,15,16;129:23;	Hold (5)	hopefully (1)	Imagine (3)
27:14	134:8;135:9	30:16;34:2,9;71:17;	58:11	48:8;104:21;146:24
handle (3)	hearing (16)	122:2	horizon (1)	immediate (1)
51:10;71:14,15	19:6;27:24;42:2;	holders (3)	14:13	71:20
handles (1)	43:22,23;44:18;74:12;	89:8,9;122:3	horrible (3)	impact (5)
51:10	92:11;104:24;119:19;	holdings (1)	60:1;63:24;130:4	91:7;94:17;95:10;
hang (1)	140:7,10;147:25;	90:17	horribly (1)	104:22;134:9
86:21	148:19;149:13;151:20	holes (1)	71:6	impacts (1)
happen (8)	heart (1)	133:20	hostages (1)	29:23
9:19;43:1;50:16;	66:24	home (1)	146:25	implement (3)
104:5,21;108:4,20;	help (8)	151:13	Hostetler (4)	95:18;140:24;141:14
143:15	39:23;64:10,12;	homes (1)	11:7,10,19;27:5	implemented (2)
happened (14)	65:21;87:20;88:3;	69:15	Hostettler (1)	94:15;114:18
45:21,25;52:16,23;	89:16;109:10	homework (2)	154:12	implicated (1)
66:6;91:22;101:9;	helpful (7) 7:12,17;83:19;99:20;	149:22;151:20	hot (1)	144:8
103:6,7;108:18;117:5, 6;121:19;129:5	140:13;144:21;152:18	honest (1) 139:17	52:17 hour (1)	importance (2)
6,121:19,129:3 happening (1)	helps (1)	honest-to-God (1)	75:16	128:1;129:9
104:4	31:1	47:20	hours (4)	important (10)
happens (13)	Henderson (1)	Honor (149)	43:18;95:8,8;139:22	30:8,24;89:5;90:18;
14:10,10;15:16;66:5,	46:8	7:20;11:9;12:3,11;	house (5)	93:3;99:1;104:5;
5;94:24;96:4,4;97:10,	Henderson's (1)	14:22;20:2;22:25;	43:17;47:4;65:6,16;	115:11;116:4;145:18
10;113:9,23;114:6	74:14	25:14,20;27:1,4,18,25;	66:16	importantly (1)
happier (1)	here's (6)	28:2,17;30:13;32:5;	housekeeping (3)	135:18
66:20	38:15;52:23;55:5;	33:16,20,25;34:5,9;	7:8;18:11;153:8	imposed (1) 79:13
happy (3)	64:19;79:5,5	35:3;39:8;42:21;43:14;	HR (3)	impossible (1)
12:5,8;33:3	hiding (1)	44:5;48:6;49:9;50:3;	28:11;54:18;141:16	125:25
hard (3)	47:13	51:17;52:2;53:21;	huge (2)	impressively (1)
30:9;104:20;144:2	high (4)	55:10,22;56:5;60:21;	50:20;136:14	68:7
hardly (1)	60:24;68:20,20;	61:8;63:7;64:16,23;	Hum (1)	improper (2)
54:24	108:23	67:8;68:12,22;69:6,10;	128:7	63:1,3
hardship (3)	higher (6)	72:2,13,22,23;73:1,5,	human (1)	improperly (1)
32:19;64:15;66:10	88:12;105:16,17;	15,17,20;74:4,12;	29:11	62:18
hardships (3)	125:19;127:8;137:25	75:23;76:2,13,16,18,	hundred (3)	in- (1)
29:25;30:2;64:21	higher-level (1)	25;78:11,18;79:1,5,14,	61:7;63:11;65:20	58:9
harm (2)	92:24	24;80:15;81:2;82:12,	hundred- (1)	inadequate (1)
19:16;62:5	highest (2)	15,19;83:2,11,21;84:2,	65:18	132:19
harsh (1)	107:14,18	10;85:1,11;86:6,8,17;	hundreds (1)	in-between (1)
41:3	highlighted (1)	87:16,18;88:16;89:7;	73:22	137:2
hat (1)	30:17	90:10,13,16,18,22;		incentive (20)

90:10,13,16,18,22;

91:4,9,11,18;92:5,9;

45:4;49:14,15;55:5,16; joined (1) indict (1) 8:5 146:14;149:2 59:1.13.22.23:67:2: 49:23 insist (5) investigate (2) 69:10 individual (11) 22:21;67:18;100:15; Jorian (1) 79:3,9;80:14,19;133:4, 63:2,3 6 41:19.20:57:5.15: 146:16:148:12 investigating (2) 11:9 incentive-based (1) insisted (2) 47:22;79:15 Joshua (1) 58:6:68:18:94:14; 119:3 102:4;123:6;124:17; 55:15;148:15 investigation (10) 28:7 incentives (13) 147:8 insofar (1) 29:17;46:3;47:10; **Judge (38)** individuals (4) 24:5;68:18;80:19,20, 13:13 49:19;75:2,6;76:1; 43:21,23,23;46:5,7,8, 22;81:7;84:11,13;99:2; 81:17;146:9;148:4, 78:20;79:11;80:6 inspect (1) 20;47:25;48:7;51:10, 104:7;121:16;142:4,12 13 55:23 investigatory (1) 22;55:17,22;56:16; incentivize (11) individual's (1) inspection (1) 74:12 58:17;60:11;61:6;63:6, 45:3,4,6;67:9;88:7, 25:10 46:21 invitation (2) 22;64:5;71:11;74:4,14; 13;101:17;102:22; industry (2) inspections (1) 19:20;149:4 77:21;79:13;85:12,17, 133:6;135:17,20 88:10;134:19 involved (8) 20;112:20,20;113:7,10, 55:21 14:7;29:18;30:14; incentivized (2) inequity (1) instability (1) 17;119:10;130:1; 88:2;129:11 148:23;149:23;152:3 36:22 115:8 63:5;102:6,13;139:1; 142:3 incentivizes (1) inference (1) instance (1) judgement (1) involvement (1) 103:11 47:23 47:15 47:21 judging (1) incentivizing (7) inferring (1) instances (3) 62:24 20:13;23:6,12,23; 116:17 47:21;75:6,10 **IPM** (5) 132:25 26:13;62:13;134:17 inflated (1) instead (3) 123:17,18;124:20, judgment (28) 36:22;38:2;106:11 19:17,17;26:5;42:14; include (2) 61:19 22:125:6 37:10;78:20 influenced (1) insult (1) irrelevant (3) 100:13;102:1;109:2,3, included (4) 46:9 67:4 103:8;129:7;142:2 4,4,8,9,18,23;120:20; 75:24;84:19;92:18, inform (1) integral (1) **issue (35)** 121:13;123:4;139:1, 22 74:2 87:25 9:14;10:14;23:1,10, 10,21;141:24;144:20, includes (3) information (30) intend (1) 25;31:21;32:22;59:25; 25;145:1,4,8;149:5; 14:23;106:6;107:17 22:14;23:2;24:21; 18:17 60:10,11;68:8;69:13, 151:24 including (9) 26:9,16,23;33:24,25; intended (3) 24,25;70:2,21;72:11; judgments (1) 15:3;92:1,24;101:1; 55:2;68:13,19,24; 18:15;129:19;146:2 82:23;85:17;94:18,19; 139:1 106:5,23,24;131:10; 110:24,25;111:1,9,11, intending (1) 98:15:103:3,5,9,9,10; juggle (1) 135:13 11.19.19.20.24:112:2: 122:10.11:134:19: 68:6 18:1 incomplete (1) 122:23;123:3;132:6; intent (1) 135:14;141:7;144:22; **Julian** (221) 36:1 137:13;138:7;141:5; 57:15 148:17:153:25 18:14;27:3,4,4,9,13, inconsistent (1) 18,22,24;28:2,7,10,16; 148:13 interaction (1) issued (2) informed (2) 75:24;113:7 30:18 111:16 30:20,23;31:1,12,14, issues (9) inconvenienced (2) 17:21;123:4 interest (1) 25;32:5,11,16,21;33:2, in-house (1) 10:18,25;25:22; 5,18;34:5,9,12,14,18, 146:15;150:8 136:13 44:25;74:1,12;114:13; 140:2 interested (1) 23;35:10,13,15,20; increase (8) Initiate (1) 60:3;91:2;99:2; 85:24 131:5;146:23 36:3,6,10,14,24;37:2,4, 103:12;112:15;115:20; 96:20 interesting (1) item (1) 7.18:38:6.10.12.15.20. initiated (1) 124:13;129:1 19:24 12:14 22;39:17,21,25;40:15, increased (3) 75:2 interests (1) 19,22;41:5,10,17,19; J 101:19;107:2;125:21 injured (1) 143:12 42:6,8,13;43:2,6,8,14; increases (3) interim (2) 44:1,3;45:2,24;46:2,6, 75:15 jail (2) 7,13,17,20,25;48:5,15, 30:11,12;126:24 innocent (2) 28:19;32:7 145:22,22 59:5,6 17,20,22,25;49:18,25; increasing (1) internally (1) 50:3,7,24;51:2,6,9,13, 123:5 input (3) 75:12 January (5) indeed (1) 109:9;121:15;136:17 interprets (1) 46:14,17,18;47:25; 17,24;52:1,22,23;53:4, 15:19 inquiry (3) 121:3 48:11 6,17,20,23,25;54:5,7, indemnification (1) 42:17,19;140:13 interrelationship (1) job (13) 12,15,18;55:4,10,13; 10:22 inside (1) 78:5 50:23,25;51:11; 56:11,15,23,25;57:5,9, independent (2) 117:14 interruption (1) 58:11,11;59:7;67:25; 11,13,15;58:8,14,17, 21;59:4,10;60:2,7,10, 17:5,6 insider (8) 71:25;81:18;91:21; 78:16 in-depth (1) 20:16,16,17,20,22; 109:21;146:4,9 13,16;61:25;62:2,8,21; interviewed (1) 119:25;120:9;148:17 127:24 42:4 jobs (2) 63:1,5,12,15;64:5,11; into (23) 81:12;104:8 indicate (3) insiders (17) 65:2,24;66:3,7;68:12, 20:23;29:18;41:13 16:10;20:9,13,21,24; 8:13;13:21;14:21; Joe (1) 17,25;69:1;74:2,21; indicated (5) 21:21,22;22:18;26:19; 18:22;19:5,16;20:15; 82:1 77:17;80:24;100:1,17; 16:9;23:9;26:17; 92:25;118:25;119:2, 36:5,8:37:8:41:2,12: John (1) 105:4;106:2;110:16, 24;120:1;142:2;144:7, 72:7;74:13;85:13; 103:2,24 28:19 23:116:1:121:10: indication (2) 86:10;93:1;105:25; joinder (3) 129:20;130:6,9,14; 14:1;62:25 insignificant (1) 116:13;135:6;141:8; 84:6;94:21;98:15 131:5,7,17,19,23,25;

132:15,21,23;133:11, 13.20.25:135:8.11: 136:5,7,22;137:1,15, 22,24;138:3,6,22; 139:16;140:14,19,21; 141:9,13;143:4,6,11, 13;147:22;148:25; 149:8;150:11,14,18,21, 23;151:4,6,14;152:6,8, 12,14,18,22;153:1,3 Julian's (5) 86:10;104:17; 107:16;123:6,8 June (1) 47:11 **jury** (3) 79:14,15;80:3 justification (1) 142:22 justified (2) 24:15;120:23 justifies (1) 145:9 justify (1) 144:13

K

Karotkin (174) 7:22,24;8:3,9;10:17; 12:18;13:3,8;14:15,16, 18,20,25;15:6,21;16:1, 3,6,9,12,15;17:9,11,14; 18:8,10,13,20,23;19:2, 4,11,19;36:15;76:2,7; 87:4,13;99:24;100:8; 101:2,7,11,14;102:10, 17,25;104:13;105:5,8, 13,16,22;106:4,17,20, 22;107:2,5,8,10,12; 108:5,9,11,22,24; 109:1.16:110:4.7.10. 13,20,22;112:1,7,10, 14;113:6,12,15,18,22; 114:1;115:4,10; 116:14,16,20,23;117:1, 4,8,12,14,24;118:1,4,6, 8,17,21;119:7,12,14, 16,20,22;120:4,8,12, 14,16,23;121:1; 122:22:123:16.18.24: 124:7,13,16,25;125:7, 9,11,15,17;126:5,18, 21,25;127:4,6,10,12, 21,24;128:7,9,11,15, 18,20,23,25;129:7,17; 130:15;140:6;141:19, 20,22;142:9,11,14,16, 18,21,22;143:2,6,8,10; 144:23;149:9;150:10; 151:7,9,18,22;152:23; 153:4

Karotkin's (1)

138:25 keep (7) 32:24;73:11;79:4; 91:12:112:20:143:22. keeping (2) 91:16;93:8 Keller (6) 8:21;9:15,24;130:21; 153:15;154:24 **KERP (6)** 16:18;119:3,4,5; 142:4,19 Kevin (1) 130:21 key (2) 16:16;134:2 kill (1) 63:11 killed (4) 31:16,16;61:7; 137:21 kills (1) 31:9 Kim (15) 7:8,20;153:6,7,8,20; 22,24 kind (8) 10:24;61:22;63:21; 94:18;100:2;104:17; 126:4:141:3

154:1,5,8,10,14,16,19,

knew (3) 12:7;117:24;134:13

knowing (1) 149:5 knowledge (2) 75:7;134:5 known (5)

36:17;53:13,13;69:9; 130:12

knows (7) 50:14;57:14;79:10; 138:8;140:16;141:15; 146:18

Kripkes (1) 37:12

 \mathbf{L} label (1) 91:7 labor (3) 58:25;59:6;99:16 lack (5) 20:1;42:17,19; 128:13;132:7 lacked (1) 110:24 Laffredi (33) 18:14;19:22;20:2,4, 4,11,18,20;21:7,13,16, 18,20;22:2,6,20,25;

23:22;24:19;25:4,7,14; 26:1,8,25;27:1;31:17, 22;110:16;111:5,8; 119:6:120:5 Laffredi's (1)

137:12 Laffreti's (1) 51:18 **laid** (4)

8:16:93:15:94:1; 97:19

land (1) 76:19

language (2) 11:1;126:16 large (2)

129:5;138:13 largely (2) 29:13;129:7

last (34) 18:13;25:15;29:24; 30:10,11,17;35:17,17; 39:12;40:4,7,11;43:12, 22;52:1,4,15;54:22;

59:6,19;60:18;61:8; 64:13;75:3,23;77:13; 78:19;95:7,25;102:11;

125:3;128:21;135:21; 136:5 Lastly (1)

61:8 late (3) 47:14,18;75:23

later (5) 15:7;48:1;116:2,3,8

latitude (1) 77:13 laugh (1) 61:19

law (16) 9:5,8;42:25;58:25; 66:15;74:10;81:21;

99:16;109:6,7,14; 120:17;121:1,3; 138:25;141:23

lawyer (5) 50:14;76:19,21; 149:20,21

lawyers (8) 11:20;42:25;44:19;

67:19;71:15;116:8; 130:18;135:24 laying (1)

88:22 layman's (1) 125:10 **layup** (15)

25:15;51:19,21,22; 53:23;55:25;112:19; 119:6,6,14,23:126:11; 133:19;135:19;149:9

layups (1) 23:8

leaders' (1) 75:7 leading (2) 29:19:131:12 learn (2) 45:10:67:3 learned (1) 146:9 learning (2)

35:24;39:23 least (14) 15:10;59:19;64:13; 71:15;88:6;99:9;100:6; 120:7;135:21;136:5;

137:18;148:10,15; 149:19 leave (4)

10:2;63:15;67:13; 133:14 leaving (1)

134:11 led (2) 45:20;83:13

left (9) 60:10;66:24;70:22; 72:16;85:3;96:24;

134:5,7;148:18 legal (1) 66:14

legitimacy (1) 137:17 length (2) 13:18;114:3

lengths (1) 122:22 lengthy (1)

69:24 less (5)

14:8;44:20;47:19; 60:5,8 lessen (1)

72:10 lesser (2) 124:11,11 letter (9)

45:11,12;106:12; 115:24;116:6,21; 117:3;136:10;154:5

letters (1) 146:7 letting (1) 78:17 level (8)

58:2,12;68:20,20; 105:18;116:14,15; 126:3

levels (3) 25:2;127:8;129:1 liabilities (2) 70:5,23

liability (1) 118:15 life (2)

53:9;128:5

light (5)

46:17,21;48:1;50:19; 55:18

lightly (2) 30:1;64:18 lights (1) 91:12

likely (3) 44:20,20;104:21

limitation (1) 131:10 limits (1) 26:5

Lincoln (1) 33:23 line (6)

18:6;29:1;32:3; 106:10;116:2,6

lines (3) 56:18:91:16:148:9

list (2) 19:14;81:25 listed (1)

80:11 listen (7) 40:9;68:9;78:8; 110:15;140:9;149:11,

listing (1) 17:25 lists (1) 81:10

litigation (1) 131:20 **little (18)**

29:8;38:18;41:3,4; 51:19;71:3;74:3;75:4; 77:9,18;99:15;100:2; 102:16;123:10;124:19;

127:4,7;143:23 live (3) 65:12;152:13,15

lived (1) 66:18 lives (1) 69:16 living (5)

LLP (1)

65:8,13,14;66:13; 99:4

87:16 local (13) 11:16;12:22,22;13:4,

20;28:4,5,6;86:24; 92:10,13,22;99:10 locally (1)

71:15 locate (5) 47:2,13;74:17,20,25

located (1) 78:21 location (1)

GAS AND ELECTRIC C	COMPANY			April 9, 2019
79.24	10.14.71.0.00.12.			56.1
78:24	10:14;71:8;80:12;	maximization (2)	meet (5)	56:1
logic (1)	100:21,22;102:14;	122:6;129:10	20:6;23:5,23;24:6;	miles (10)
38:7	137:19	maximize (6)	99:4	24:11;25:8;54:20;
long (10)	majority (4)	91:3,6;102:21;	meetings (3)	56:1,1;132:5,13;138:8;
53:13;59:23;61:22;	62:23;145:25;146:1,	114:21;115:16,17	131:8,11;132:12	140:15;148:7
71:11;75:21;79:10;	2	maximizes (1)	members (7)	militates (1)
105:1;109:21;130:12;	makes (6)	90:23	8:7,14;12:23;13:20;	31:1
141:5	26:11;32:16;90:6;	maximizing (1)	17:5,15;65:6	million (24)
longer (1)	109:9;125:25;126:25	91:24	memory (2)	15:3;35:7,15;37:10;
75:17	making (16)	maximum (14)	42:8;82:16	38:8,13,13;39:5;40:5,
long-term (5)	9:1;13:22;19:9;24:7;	39:3;90:21;104:19,	mentality (1)	11,12;57:22,24;61:10,
36:11;37:5,7,18;89:9	31:2;40:25;49:13;	19,19;105:10,11,12,13;	146:11	12,12;65:20;104:20;
look (23)	50:18;52:12;82:10;	108:2,6;125:5,20,22	mention (2)	106:7,23,24;107:17;
24:3;33:18;39:7;	94:12;127:12;130:13;	may (20)	32:11;112:1	108:7,15
51:19;52:2;58:25;	145:10;149:13;152:24	18:24,24;22:4,19;	mentioned (5)	million-dollar (1)
				65:19
62:14,16;74:13;80:10;	manage (1)	27:25;32:25;34:9;35:6;	105:6;118:24;119:9;	
82:15;88:10;107:8;	118:12	36:24;37:11;39:18;	132:11;135:15	millions (2)
112:21;118:11;120:22;	management (15)	46:25;62:2;68:21;71:2;	merely (1)	44:24,24
121:6;132:5;134:13,	23:15,19;26:4;58:23;	81:20;129:15;133:22;	101:25	mind (5)
17,24;135:15,16	83:12;84:18;100:11;	141:20;143:23	merit (2)	30:13;40:17;66:24;
looked (5)	103:11;109:4,9,18;	Maybe (23)	30:10;40:3	77:18;91:6
25:1;139:23,24,25;	115:11;131:3,4,5	13:16;15:25;17:1,3;	message (8)	mindful (1)
140:2	manager (2)	38:18;50:1;57:7,10;	28:15;52:6;63:8;	145:3
looking (18)	83:3,9	63:21,21;72:8,8;85:19;	64:8;65:17;66:7;85:21;	mine (1)
24:4;29:21;34:3,10,	managers (4)	95:19;114:9,10;	87:11	51:11
13,16;50:8;53:2;64:9;	51:2;61:2;82:9;	116:10;126:24;132:8,	met (3)	minimize (1)
89:23;105:23;106:19;	92:24	16,17;137:19;145:6	25:23;29:22;133:16	31:22
107:16;123:11;124:4;	manner (1)	mean (92)	metric (12)	minimizing (1)
133:2;140:2;143:11	88:8	8:1,4;10:9,15,21;	25:8;29:9;32:8;	122:9
looks (7)	many (12)	11:12;13:23;18:21,24;	45:11;47:18;56:7;	minimum (7)
39:11;40:8;52:12;	24:11;25:8;30:2,9;	19:12,12,14;20:9,16,	88:11;123:5;125:12,	39:3;100:9;104:18,
56:2,18;61:4;70:22	32:2;64:21;100:19;	21,24;21:8,8,23;22:3,	18;132:5;135:22	19,20;125:23;127:7
losses (2)	116:2;142:1;144:18;	12,15;23:22;25:3;	metrics (55)	minor (2)
37:15;42:19	148:6,7	27:10;28:4;30:17;	19:14;20:14;23:7;	8:4,19
lot (16)	March (4)	31:14;32:3;37:17,20;	24:4,4;25:1;29:8;	minute (7)
10:12;19:13;42:25;	30:11;130:19;	40:8,13,16,25;41:16;	31:18;33:14;39:2;	30:17;67:14;69:14;
50:15,16,16;52:3;53:7;	131:15,23	42:4,7;49:14;53:12;	45:14;47:16;51:8;	100:18;141:19,20;
72:2;77:17;91:19;	mark (7)	54:13;56:22;57:6;	54:18;55:24;56:4;57:2;	148:1
113:10;115:7,8;141:5;	47:3,14;51:3;74:17,	58:23;60:9;61:4,12,23;	60:25;61:17;62:9;	minutes (12)
146:7	20,25;78:21	66:4;76:3;82:2,5;85:3,	64:12;67:11;84:21;	75:17;87:7;111:18;
lots (3)	market (5)	7;86:25;90:5;91:7,7;	88:4,24;89:20,23;	121:11;131:8;132:12,
44:23,23;89:5	41:14,23;59:16;	92:17;94:25;96:17,18;	100:17;101:18;103:13;	14,15,23;140:22;
lower (2)	134:5,12	97:11,12;98:9,10,13;	104:8;108:12,17;	143:17;147:23
38:18;110:2	market-based (2)	100:12;104:18;106:15;	112:12,16;118:23;	misconception (1)
LTIP (16)	115:6;122:19	110:18;112:6;115:2;	119:8;121:14;126:5;	118:9
14:23;15:1,3,9;	materially (1)	116:3,5;131:19;	132:1;133:3,21;	misleading (2)
35:21;36:2;39:21;	107:2	132:13,18;133:15,23;	137:17,23,24,24;140:4,	35:25;107:12
59:20;61:11;92:25;	math (1)	135:2,5,5;137:2,3,3,8,	8;142:1,1,12;147:10,	misread (1)
106:1,5,6,24,25;107:18	39:5	20;138:5;139:5;	21;148:10;149:23	15:25
lumped (1)	matrices (1)	153:18;154:9	middle (1)	misreading (1)
	112:5	means (14)	126:9	126:16
93:1		` ,		
M	matter (8)	46:15;57:1,7;58:10;	might (31)	missing (3)
M	7:4;12:24;18:11;	59:12,14;98:6;110:19;	24:3;26:12,18;31:3;	116:10,11,11
	33:14;52:5;119:23,24;	124:6;125:8,9;126:9;	56:24;58:5,23;62:18;	misspoke (1)
ma'am (1)	153:8	148:6;151:14	63:24;64:4,4,5,8;70:7;	16:5
92:7	mattered (1)	meant (1)	81:13,17;100:12;	misstating (2)
magically (4)	142:5	46:13	106:3;107:22;117:18,	93:7;137:20
44:14;64:2;67:15,23	matters (4)	Meanwhile (1)	18,22;126:11;137:6,7,	mistaken (1)
main (3)	8:1;74:13;109:17;	141:6	9;142:25,25;146:22;	45:20
39:14;132:25;133:1	112:4	measures (1)	147:15;148:14	Mistry (17)
maintain (2)	max (9)	114:17	Milbank (2)	21:5;28:12;41:11,21;
33:9;93:3	33:22;107:4,6,6,10,	mechanics (1)	87:16,22	54:19;57:12;120:6;
maion (7)	15 17.127.1 5	15.0	mile (1)	120.2.122.2.12.127.6.

mile (1)

129:2;132:3,13;137:6;

15:8

15,17;127:1,5

major (7)

21;15:12;17:22;24:14; 138:6;139:13;140:7; multipliers (1) 141:15:147:17:150:18 34:7:36:22:37:21: 57:2 Murphy (2) Mistry's (4) 38:17:44:20:54:14: 17:2;119:25;132:19; 59:24:61:21:66:21: 37:13:66:14 134:4 67:23;68:13,18,23,24; musing (1) misunderstood (1) 69:18;74:3;81:14; 36:16 16:7 84:22;106:12;108:4,6; **must (5)** mitigation (4) 20:10;29:3;31:6; 112:1;113:11,13,13; 101:20;112:17,23; 64:12;146:5 116:9;121:6;123:10; 113:2 124:19;126:25;127:2. myself (6) mixed (1) 6,8;128:20;135:17; 33:3;40:11;44:17; 66:20,22;149:11 120:13 136:4,16,16;139:8,8; modern (1) 141:21;142:20,22; mystery (1) 143:25;144:5;145:17; 118:6 146:11 modernize (2) 146:24;147:13;151:24 N 93:3,9 moreover (1) 112:15 modifications (6) morning (16) 13:25;94:16;95:23; name (2) 73:16;74:18 111:21;113:3,4 7:7;11:9;12:14;27:4; modified (5) 69:6,8;73:1,5;86:4; names (9) 94:8;97:5,22;99:19; 87:15:90:13:92:8,9; 21:1,10;74:23;81:7, 120:6;149:17;153:11 111:22 11,11,11,11,19 modifier (4) mosaic (2) Name's (1) 57:5,16;94:14;123:7 66:21.23 73:17 modifiers (1) **most (9)** Napa (1) 147:8 7:15;8:22;32:2; 60:20 57:16;63:22;71:13,14, modify (2) nature (2) 94:5;104:10 23,24 23:6;49:12 modifying (1) mostly (1) nauseam (1) 74:9 137:16 30:6 necessarily (1) moment (7) motion (26) 9:14:14:18:31:4: 12:15:13:6.18.24: 102:6 necessary (6) 32:12;62:2;70:1;99:17 14:6;26:24;63:16,17; Monday (1) 69:5:72:16:87:22: 9:18;91:21;101:16; 137:9,14;148:16 96:1 90:22;91:1;92:3;93:20; monetary (1) 97:12,15;99:9;116:2; need (42) 7:18;9:19;10:4;14:1, 37:16 118:1,14:131:22; 133:25:134:1:144:4.14 12;24:1,1,2;25:17; **money** (14) 14:8,21;15:12,13; motions (1) 44:7;53:20;55:13,20, 26:14;36:23;38:3; 14:12 23:60:20:61:3:66:7.7: 47:19:49:6:57:20: motivate (3) 68:13,13,24;69:15; 106:12,13;113:10; 103:11;109:3;122:12 73:16:76:23:88:7:91:2: 116:7 motivated (1) 140:15,16,21,25;141:6, money's (1) 104:5 13;146:13,19;147:13; movable (2) 57:20 148:7;149:13;150:6,8, monitor (3) 36:12,13 23;152:4,16 48:8,8;74:13 move (3) needed (4) 141:2;146:17;151:12 monitorship (1) 13:1;89:1;123:3; 74:15 moved (1) 153:24 Montali (1) 33:11 needs (5) 48:6 moving (11) 40:13;55:23;63:23; 17:19,19,20;55:3; month (4) 67:25;90:7 negotiate (1) 16:22;30:12;71:19; 94:13;95:2;103:4,24, 25;115:15,15 94:11 75:23 months (8) much (15) negotiated (7) 48:1;55:18;57:19,21, 38:1;40:14;44:13; 94:5;95:9,22;96:23; 23;106:12;138:15,16 72:5;85:3,5,23;86:18; 99:6:100:16,18 months' (1) 88:12;99:22;119:4; negotiating (2) 45:9 127:7;135:1,17;155:1 89:22;98:13 morale (1) multi (1) negotiation (1) 141:6 34:12 89:21 more (58) multiplied (1) Neither (2) 10:13,20;14:3,7,12, 39:4 62:21;127:17

neutral (1) 52:17 new (18) 34:6;36:21;43:9; 47:10,10;53:1;55:20; 59:22;62:9;77:20; 79:12,12;95:23;100:6, 7,10,10;102:2 news (2) 45:19;65:18 next (17) 8:12;10:7;16:22,22, 22;30:4,7;31:5;32:16; 39:17;42:20;53:6; 62:11;71:19,19;98:7; 130:24 nice (1) 119:18 night (2) 52:1;125:3 nine (7) 45:9:57:19.21.23: 90:18;138:15,16 ninety (3) 49:6;58:3;125:18 ninety-five (1) 126:15 ninety-nine (1) 107:20 nobody (1) 75:14 none (1) 8:9 non-insider (1) 120:4 non-performance (1) 31:7 nonrepresented (1) 92:23 nontechnical (1) 148:21 normal (3) 15:1;59:12,14 normally (1) 17:20 North (1) 79:22 Northern (1) 11:16 Northstar (2) 33:6,7 northwest (1) 135:3 noted (2) 25:16;106:8 noteholders (1) 90:15 notice (1) 125:5 November (3) 42:22;113:23;138:16 nuclear (2)

number (20) 12:23:39:7:50:1.21: 55:5:60:24:75:11: 81:18:89:14:108:25: 126:15;127:16,17,17, 17;131:7;132:11; 138:12.12.13 numbers (5) 15:1,21;40:13;56:25; 106:6 0 oath (1) 130:20 object (2) 122:2,4 objection (8) 13:13;18:6,8;19:10; 20:5;25:21;40:22;71:4 objections (2) 13:17.24 objectives (1) 37:9 objectors (1) 103:20 obsolescence (1) 53:10 obtained (1) 84:21 obvious (3) 8:25;71:9,10 obviously (6) 18:3,17;46:9;60:9; 80:12:135:14 occurred (2) 45:23;49:2 October (1) 42:22 off (8) 12:19;55:14,14; 75:16.18.23:82:22: 126:14 offended (1) 78:16 offer (3) 128:22,24,25 offering (1) 32:6 office (2) 73:20;100:7 officer (4) 11:4;48:10;117:21; 129:25 officers (3) 48:18,20;144:19 officer's (1) 48:25 official (4) 8:6:27:5:90:20:95:9 old (3) 52:11:53:1,6

61:4.5

once (1)

GAS AND ELECTRIC C	OMPANY			April 9, 2015
17.00	(2)	15111	20.25.25.45.16.16	17 10 20 20 10 1
17:22	opponents (2)	154:14	28:25;35:4,5,16,16,	17:19,20,20;18:1
One (90)	17:24;54:24	ourselves (7)	16;57:23;69:18,25;	pass (1)
7:8;8:2,17,18,20,21;	opportunity (16)	7:14;29:1,10,24;	70:7,19;71:11,12;	12:19
10:7;11:4,6,12;13:25;	18:4,25;19:1;21:4;	66:9;116:1,24	80:19,20,22;81:7,13;	passed (1)
14:2,18;15:9;17:3;	86:7;103:18;114:19,	out (68)	91:23;97:18;105:9,10;	34:20
28:18;31:21;32:2;33:7,		` /		
	19,19;115:5;122:18;	7:5;8:16;15:9;24:23;	108:3,15;116:12;	past (19)
21;34:3,9,10,15,19;	129:12,21;147:18;	26:10;32:9,17;33:25;	117:8,22;118:10,22;	24:4,5,5,6;26:12;
35:12,14;36:21;37:22,	149:1;150:17	34:9;35:4,5,16,16,16;	122:19;124:6,21;	30:14;47:1;49:5;60:6,
23;41:24;42:10,18;	opposed (4)	36:8;38:13;41:3;45:13;	142:24;146:21	7;81:20,21;91:23;
44:5,7;47:16,22;48:11;	61:22;105:3,4;	49:7,7;50:5,21;52:10,	pain (2)	103:6,7;105:14;129:5;
49:3;52:18,18;53:1;	141:15	20;57:20,21,23;61:13;	72:2,11	133:1;135:23
55:5;56:10;57:1,16;	opposing (1)	62:8;63:2;64:1,17;	painful (3)	Pat (1)
	19:8			66:14
58:4,10;60:10,24;		65:2,3,10,20;66:15;	70:8,20;82:16	
61:25;62:3;65:6,14;	opposite (2)	67:2;68:1,2,3,10;	painting (1)	patent (2)
66:11;67:13;69:20;	114:25;115:22	70:13;73:13;77:22;	50:20	152:2,3
71:9;72:7,17;88:21;	opposition (5)	82:11;87:6;91:20;	palace (1)	patience (1)
100:13,20;108:19;	18:2;28:5;69:5;	93:15;97:19;99:14;	58:23	143:21
109:25;110:18;111:8,	72:16;84:6	104:23;105:9,10;	paper (3)	Patrick (1)
23,24;112:1;118:11;	oppositions (1)	113:10;122:5;124:10;	17:2;29:9;70:15	37:13
	69:11	130:13;134:2,18;	papers (12)	
122:24;123:6,8,12;				pause (1)
125:24;127:17;129:21;	optimistic (1)	135:1,16;138:14,15;	8:16;17:22;32:14;	30:16
134:20;136:4;138:12;	71:16	143:11;145:1;146:9;	34:4;55:3;56:14;58:5;	pavement (1)
139:11;141:2,20;	option (3)	150:6	73:9;103:2,19;106:8;	47:4
143:21;144:5;145:25;	9:17;85:18;102:2	outline (1)	112:3	pay (45)
152:6;153:8;154:24	options (1)	147:11	Paradise (2)	23:20,24;29:3;30:11,
ones (7)	144:9	outset (1)	29:13;65:5	12;32:17;41:23;42:5;
8:19;17:13;21:24;	order (37)	122:17	paragraph (3)	45:9;58:13,24;59:2,13,
80:12;96:5,5;102:8	7:3;9:20,20,23;10:2;	outside (2)	30:7;113:17;125:4	13,15;65:20;67:2,2,21;
ongoing (1)	11:18,25;12:6;25:9;	109:10;121:5	parameters (1)	68:14,17;70:3,21;71:2,
101:19	33:6;47:1,9,20;51:15;	outstanding (1)	26:5	16;79:3,17;88:19;95:6;
only (34)	74:4,9,15;90:25;91:5;	122:24	Pardon (1)	97:23;99:3;106:11;
8:20;9:15;10:8;	98:25;102:21;112:21;	over (15)	128:11	116:11;117:9,17,22;
12:14;16:15,18;17:17;	113:7;117:9;122:14;	10:19;28:16;30:5,14;	parent (1)	118:4;119:1,1;128:3;
33:15;45:17;72:17;	125:17,19;130:10;	39:9;46:8;61:7;73:21;	17:8	134:11,18;135:16;
84:25;85:3,5;88:2;	131:1;139:24;141:3;	75:15;107:21;111:18;	part (25)	150:2,3
89:15;91:24;93:1;	150:6;153:23;154:2,7,	123:2;136:25;139:11;	19:23;22:6;23:10,25;	paying (10)
98:11,20;108:19;	12,17	147:15	29:20;36:5;37:14;	9:12;29:24;32:9;
109:25;112:25;114:10,	ordered (1)	overall (4)	39:11;52:11;59:12,13,	33:15;66:9;85:16,17;
22;119:25;123:20;	81:24	33:15;52:4;60:18,18	14;67:8;69:12;87:19,	106:11;118:15;134:9
124:11;129:21;134:20;	orders (7)	overrule (1)	25;93:11;98:23;99:1,3;	payment (17)
144:25;147:1;149:17;	10:5;74:11;81:22;	13:24	100:13;102:9,11;	15:4;29:1;33:10;
153:23,24	153:12,15,20;154:19	overruled (1)	103:13;138:4	35:6;47:15;50:4,7;
oOo- (1)	ordinary (1)	145:2	participants (2)	62:12,14;94:13;102:3,
	• , ,			
7:2	121:5	overtime (1)	15:10;36:2	4;104:17;114:11,11;
open (2)	original (4)	52:2	participate (3)	117:2;125:17
13:9;82:3	74:14;123:18,19;	own (8)	21:13;100:16;111:7	payments (24)
opening (2)	131:22	36:16;52:13;60:5;	particular (9)	14:22;33:21;34:24,
120:6;121:7	originally (1)	69:11;137:3;140:2;	25:10;56:9;70:8;	25;35:10;40:4;45:10;
operate (3)	126:2	144:24;152:24	81:9;93:18,19;112:16;	79:9;93:11,15;94:2,13;
103:15;114:16;	Orsini (1)	1 2 . , 1 6 2 . 2 .	150:7;153:10	95:6;98:25;101:24;
122:11	130:21	P	particularly (5)	104:11;113:24;114:5,
		1	• • •	
operates (1)	OSC (2)	m (4)	69:20;70:20;86:11;	8,9,10;124:10,12;
148:5	46:20;48:1	Pacific (1)	109:16;150:8	138:17
operating (2)	others (10)	130:23	parties (6)	payout (4)
70:4,24	26:3;29:2;30:2;	package (1)	12:16;13:22;88:21;	61:9;125:19,22,23
operation (3)	63:23;64:21;68:10;	96:23	94:24;97:14;146:21	pays (2)
101:19;103:16;	73:22;87:5;100:17;	page (8)	parties-in-interest (1)	79:9;116:8
109:11	129:8	28:22;29:5;30:4;	24:3	PE&C (1)
operations (4)	otherwise (3)	31:14;41:21;64:14;	partner (1)	33:5
22:10;110:14;	102:4;118:18;121:17	78:23;134:4	66:15	peer (1)
112:14;114:17	ought (2)	pages (1)	parts (3)	88:10
opinion (2)	133:25;146:8	42:1	20:15;69:13;135:4	peers (6)
132:22;145:12	ours (1)	paid (34)	party (4)	59:16;68:20;134:18,

			I	
18,20,23	perhaps (10)	12:6;110:3	72:21;73:10,14	practitioners (1)
penalty (1)	13:21;16:18,18;	picked (1)	point (44)	11:16
130:20	18:10;21:11;22:23;	50:7	11:21,22;29:5;32:16;	pre-break (1)
pending (3)	23:17;41:7;45:19;	picks (1)	33:16;39:14;41:10;	86:5
75:1;95:5;118:1	146:4	101:25	44:1,3;55:5;57:9;59:4;	precisely (2)
pensioneers (1)	period (5)	picture (3)	60:12;61:8;62:3;68:9;	106:6,22
89:8	28:21;47:6;131:11,	29:22;57:25;66:20	70:7;71:1,22;77:16;	predecessors (1)
people (67)	12;148:2	pie (1)	80:13,15,18;85:20;	85:23
14:2;15:17,19,22,22,	perjury (1)	115:20	86:23;90:18;117:19;	predicate (5)
23;17:11;19:21;21:10;	130:20	piece (2)	129:14,22;131:19,25;	120:11,12,16,17,18
22:1,4,7;23:19;26:20;	permission (1)	59:20;110:25	132:8,19,25;133:1;	predicates (1)
30:1;31:16,17;36:20;	104:16	piece-by-piece (1)	134:15,19;135:11;	88:22
37:4;38:2;43:1;50:21;	permissive (1)	66:22	136:17;137:25;141:7;	predict (2)
52:7;57:1;58:11;61:7;	24:14	PINO (9)	147:2;149:12;150:4	70:9;109:22
62:13,17,19,23;63:12,	permitted (2)	72:23;73:1,5,8;	pointed (1)	predicted (1)
13;64:3,4,15;66:15;	60:18;124:1	83:25;86:4,6,17,18	122:5	67:1
70:21;81:11,12,20;	person (8)	Pion (1)	pointing (1)	prefer (1)
82:10;84:13,17;91:16,	21:24;22:9,11,11;	73:5	70:21	22:7
21;92:2;93:8;94:24;	41:22;83:6;145:23,24	pitch (1)	points (10)	preferably (1)
103:6;106:11;109:20;	personal (8)	78:8	8:4;30:7;85:22;	88:20
110:1,13;113:10;	60:5;83:12;86:20;	place (9)	123:6,9;129:15;130:9;	prejudicial (1) 114:22
114:15,16,16,18;115:7;	137:13;146:19;148:13; 149:16,17	35:22,23;42:12;	138:22;147:20;151:21	
116:11;122:18,19;	*	59:23;60:17;85:19;	poked (1) 133:20	preliminary (5)
133:6;134:7;139:2; 141:24;148:21	personally (1) 60:4	101:4;114:18;148:14 plaintiff (2)	political (1)	12:17;14:9;15:15; 17:17;75:6
people's (4)	personnel (1)	73:7;86:8	146:19	prematurely (1)
74:23;134:10;	82:3	plan (64)	poorest (1)	62:18
137:13;141:16	persons (1)	16:12,17;23:6,12,13,	70:14	premised (1)
per (1)	86:20	23;24:13,15;25:24;	portion (2)	119:8
34:25	perspective (1)	33:12,22;36:11;37:5,8,	98:20;106:1	prepared (4)
percent (35)	64:24	8,9,18;41:2;45:4;55:6,	position (11)	62:19;100:24;
15:1;24:11;30:23;	persuade (1)	6;56:2;59:22,23;70:14;	12:20,22;13:1,19;	144:13;145:4
40:3;49:6;56:6,7;58:3,	18:24	71:19;79:3,9;80:23;	16:23;87:23;92:23;	preparing (3)
4,6,8;61:6;101:18;	persuaded (3)	82:13;83:3;84:19;	95:17;99:19;117:7;	7:10;43:19;44:18
105:19,20;106:6;	94:22;107:21;144:7	85:13;94:15;96:21;	123:15	pre-petition (6)
107:20,22;112:15;	persuasive (2)	101:20,22;103:13,13,	positions (2)	29:2;117:2,4,15;
123:5,23;125:13,13,15,	43:10;63:20	22;104:25;105:4,4;	26:20;86:9	118:15;121:23
18,20,21,21,22,23;	PG&E (36)	106:5,14,16,16;112:17,	possibility (1)	present (3)
126:3,4,10;139:8,9	7:4,6;33:21;36:18;	23;113:2,19;115:20;	44:21	17:20;24:1;131:13
percentage (3)	43:20;46:22;48:3;52:6,	118:22;119:4,8,24;	possible (6)	presentation (6)
33:21;58:13;59:7	11;55:5;63:25;70:6;	120:4;121:20;124:9;	79:12,16;90:9;114:8;	40:20;68:11;129:16;
percentages (1)	71:1,7;73:22;74:10,11;	133:1,3,6;134:15;	122:16;135:25	133:18;149:19;150:15
139:8	75:16,20,25;78:12,22,	142:11	possibly (3)	presented (3)
perfect (3)	23;79:8,12,16,16;	plans (2)	54:22;81:16;119:19	95:24;112:21;144:9
52:3;90:4;150:5	83:12,16;86:15;94:5;	29:22;102:1	post (1)	presenting (1)
perform (2)	95:21;102:12;130:23;	play (1)	53:2	149:21
38:24;88:4 performance (38)	134:5;146:10 PG&E's (4)	45:13 pleadings (3)	post-petition (3) 117:3,6;118:15	presently (1) 45:17
29:7,24;30:12;31:8,	28:11;46:21;74:10;	71:1;109:14;121:2	post-San (1)	preserve (1)
15;32:9,17;33:10,12,	75:8	Please (1)	46:11	102:21
13,14;38:25;39:8;56:9,	ph (1)	143:20	potential (7)	preserves (1)
19;57:5,16,19;60:19;	123:17	pleasure (1)	16:15;35:18;63:10;	88:19
67:3;79:11;84:12;90:1;	phenomenal (2)	87:13	91:19,20;92:25;124:23	preside (1)
94:14;102:23;104:8;	108:13,13	plight (1)	potentially (1)	46:8
105:18;108:11,13,13;	phone (4)	136:9	116:9	president (1)
122:13;123:7;124:23;	12:13;72:24;86:21,	plus (6)	pound (1)	22:12
126:3,3;132:5;147:8,	21	35:4,12;40:7;59:1;	103:21	presiding (1)
10	phonetic (5)	60:3;138:22	power (2)	71:10
performance-based (1)	23:9;37:12,12;66:15;	pm (3)	91:17;148:9	press (2)
31:6	131:16	143:18,18;155:2	PPAs (1)	100:6;135:9
performing (4)	phrasing (1)	pockets (1)	89:9	presumably (1)
82:10;83:10;84:13;	95:19	72:7	practice (1)	147:17
138:15	pick (2)	podium (3)	75:9	presume (1)

GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY April 9, 2019				
133:16	146:23;155:2	24:2;104:24	45:10;49:12,17;50:7;	read (35)
pretend (1)	process (8)	provide (5)	57:23;79:9;80:19;	9:16;17:21;28:17;
99:16	29:4;31:19;41:25;	26:16,23;97:18;	94:13;101:24;102:3;	36:19;40:10;42:3;
pretending (1)	42:3;54:16;60:17;	104:7;114:2	104:9;114:5;123:19;	45:12;56:2,17,21;58:5,
102:7	94:11;141:4	provided (3)	124:10,11,25;138:14,	7,18;65:17;66:11,12;
pre-trial (3)	produce (2)	22:22;74:7;111:1	17;139:5	73:9;75:4;76:14;84:7;
139:14;141:4;149:3	130:24;133:21	provides (2)	quick (2)	94:21;110:17,18;
pretty (5)	product (1)	26:9;93:14	8:1;153:8	112:3,5;116:21;
22:4;50:5;56:3;	139:20	providing (1)	quickly (5)	118:13,13,16;121:1;
71:10;85:23	professional (6)	103:16	42:2;146:17;149:15;	123:13;126:23;127:15;
prevent (3)	7:23;8:18,19;10:11;	proving (1)	151:3,12	142:25;147:10
63:19,20;104:3	121:15;139:1	137:17	quite (5)	reading (6)
prevention (1)	professionals (11)	provisions (2)	56:13;61:5;115:22;	31:10,11;43:7;55:19;
91:2	9:12;10:10,11,23,25;	13:12;83:3	141:5;147:2	86:10;126:8
prevents (1)	11:17;44:6;63:6;67:6;	prudent (4)	quote (2)	ready (2)
26:18	139:9;147:6	49:8;56:16,17;64:19	46:18;111:17	7:22;151:10
previously (2)	Professors (1)	public (7)	quoted (2)	real (4)
9:11;149:15	37:12	23:1;36:18;81:8,15,	33:9;116:1	24:17;39:6;56:25;
price (2)	program (18)	17,25;82:8		101:10
70:5,22	33:8;34:19;35:21;	publicized (1)	R	realistically (1)
prima (3)	37:14;55:16;61:14,22;	100:4		69:17
20:9;120:7;133:16	74:17,17;78:21;89:19;	PUC (12)	radical (1)	reality (1)
Prime (4)	94:12;95:23;101:4;	46:2;47:1,9,10,22;	80:16	72:2
10:8,15,17;11:2	121:13,16;122:3,4	53:11;55:20;56:2;	Radovsky (1)	realize (5)
prior (12)	progress (1)	63:22;78:25;139:23,24	84:3	21:9,14;104:23;
35:22;36:20;100:11,	52:12	pun (1)	raise (5)	114:19;129:10
18;101:25;105:17;	progresses (1)	91:14	23:20,24;24:23;40:3;	really (27)
112:11;129:1;145:5;	70:25	punish (1)	135:22	7:11;10:7;14:13;
146:10;147:20;151:10	projected (2)	129:12	raised (1)	15:15;17:1,23;22:15,
priority (1) 121:25	34:17,25 proof (5)	punished (1) 146:25	70:1	16,21;25:16;27:11; 30:14;36:16;38:16,22;
privy (1)	20:9;128:22,24,25;	punishment (2)	ramifications (4)	39:13;43:16;44:12;
70:12	141:3	103:10;122:11	99:16;146:19,20,20 range (5)	55:25;61:4;91:14;
probably (13)	proper (6)	pure (2)	58:5;124:23;126:2,2,	94:18;99:1;110:17;
8:20;18:5;42:11;	8:22;44:15;49:4;	38:7;142:11	16	133:5;135:19;138:15
44:18;55:7;64:23;	88:5,24;122:11	purpose (3)	ranges (1)	reason (3)
65:18;71:21;104:15;	properly (2)	40:19;76:11;152:25	147:7	28:23;75:21;102:4
109:21;129:24;131:22;	145:1;149:6	purposes (1)	rank (7)	reasonable (1)
146:11	property (2)	19:5	64:16;72:1;81:12;	142:3
probation (11)	65:8;121:4	put (25)	82:23;90:23;91:11;	reasons (10)
48:10,18,20,25;49:1,	proponents (2)	24:1;25:2,21;29:1;	119:4	38:1,23;63:1;89:5,6;
2;74:10;77:22;79:12,	41:2;145:13	30:10;36:8;37:8;41:12;	rank-and-file (1)	90:10;139:21;145:5;
13;113:13	proposal (3)	59:5,6;62:19;67:13;	93:2	149:16,16
problem (26)	116:12;123:18,20	68:14;72:7;85:13;	rare (1)	rebuild (3)
8:8,13;11:4,5;20:11;	propose (2)	105:25;116:1,24;	144:25	51:12,13;69:15
24:8;25:7,18;52:11;	139:17;149:15	128:15;141:22;144:2;	rate (5)	recall (3)
54:21;61:2,5;62:10,24;	proposed (4)	148:4;150:10;152:19;	15:1;33:24;34:25;	75:13;86:21;139:22
63:14,18;71:24;96:12;	14:22;26:1;149:25;	154:7	41:13;103:18	receive (4)
105:2;132:2;137:11;	153:14	putting (5)	rather (8)	93:15;125:17,19;
138:10,10,11,23,24	proposing (1)	7:16;32:24;66:22;	11:21;28:18;44:20;	127:7
problems (1)	113:19	71:1;81:15	49:12;53:9;84:12;	received (1)
23:16 procedure (6)	prospective (5) 103:14;121:20;	Q	139:4;151:11 rational (2)	130:15 receiving (2)
8:11;9:21;12:24;	122:12;129:4;133:1	Q	142:4;147:12	84:13,16
17:18;37:24;152:8	prospectively (1)	qualifications (1)	rationale (3)	recent (2)
procedures (4)	102:20	109:24	121:13,16;122:5	55:18;78:19
8:15;10:22;18:13;	protect (1)	qualified (1)	rationales (1)	recently (2)
54:5	23:2	139:2	81:8	55:18;63:22
proceed (2)	protecting (1)	qualify (1)	reach (4)	Recess (2)
18:7,10	100:25	26:21	25:9;26:12;75:22;	87:8;143:18
proceeding (1)	protects (1)	quarter (1)	150:3	recipients (1)
77:22	94:6	62:6	reached (1)	92:25
proceedings (2)	prove (2)	quarterly (19)	54:10	recitals (2)

8:23:9:25 7:21 repeating (2) 13:14:154:6 recites (1) regulars (1) 129:13:147:4 reserved (1) repetition (1) 154:4 9:16 53:12 reckless (1) regulations (1) 77:18 resolution (3) 81:21 rephrase (1) 29:3;131:9;146:17 49:8 recognition (1) reimbursed (1) 95:7 respect (10) 130:4 8:15 replace (3) 13:8;45:25;83:3,16; reinspect (1) 90:8:99:9:109:16; recognize (10) 53:7,9,15 23:15;29:25;30:9; 46:22 110:11;134:25;153:21 reply (4) 22:16;25:21;98:17; 73:19;81:18;101:16, reject (1) respected (1) 22;109:7;122:4;129:9 95:2 129:20 76:21 rejected (2) recognizes (1) report (21) respective (1) 64:15 97:5;146:22 13:25;16:25;21:1; 131:9 recognizing (2) relate (1) 22:13;33:6,7;47:7,9; respects (2) 62:4;71:21 68:7 48:12;54:9;70:4,24; 40:24;142:2 recommendations (1) 75:3,5,20,24;76:1; related (1) respond (4) 99:3 18:4;19:25;110:25; 32:12 78:19;140:3,23,23 recommended (2) relates (1) reported (1) 129:21 responded (1) 114:5;141:16 33:19 75:10 reconfiguration (1) relations (1) reporting (2) 47:11 10:13;48:10 responding (1) 67:11 85:9 record (9) relationship (1) reports (3) 7:13 27:14;41:11;45:7; 14:15 29:17;46:21;93:7 response (7) 48:2:76:4:86:10: relatively (2) represent (4) 8:6;10:4;12:25; 130:14;138:12;142:23 71:13;73:11 58:5;91:25;95:13; 19:25;20:1;132:19; recordkeeping (4) relevance (2) 129:25 141:21 47:17;61:1,1;77:11 76:23,25 representation (4) responsibilities (2) records (17) reliability (2) 9:18:10:1;80:2; 21:2;26:21 45:8,9,15,20;46:11; 84:12.14 153:19 responsibility (1) 47:3,13,24;49:15,19, relied (1) representations (1) 83:13 20;61:3;75:7,8;77:11; 140:22 9:1 responsible (3) 78:24:79:4 relief (2) representative (1) 81:20:109:11:110:14 recoup (2) 23:3:144:13 147:17 rest (2) 116:18:118:21 rely (4) representatives (10) 50:2;92:13 48:2;99:4;141:24; recover (1) 18:4;67:19;75:20; restructuring (7) 147:6 86:24;144:12;145:15, 11:3;87:20;88:1,9, 66:23 15,22;90:9 remain (2) 19;148:4,20;149:20 recovery (1) 13:9;87:10 115:18 represented (6) result (2) 92:12,22;93:2;95:15; 103:23;127:21 red (2) remaining (2) 34:19;35:12 16:13;22:17 99:9:136:13 resulted (1) reduced (3) remarks (2) represents (2) 111:20 105:20;125:12,22 73:25;145:5 73:21;121:21 results (1) reduction (1) remember (1) request (4) 29:9 40:6 118:13 19:8;122:23,24; resume (1) remind (2) refer (2) 153:12 86:23 109:22;134:3 30:8;119:17 requested (2) retained (3) reminder (1) 111:1;144:15 9:21;10:22;12:8 reference (3) 11:13;17:4;24:22 9:14 requests (2) retention (11) referring (7) reminding (1) 130:23;131:2 8:19;9:20,24;11:2, 30:11;55:19;64:22; 146:7 require (2) 18,25;16:16;55:6; 65:22;74:22;76:3; remote (2) 9:6;97:24 142:11:153:9,9 112:20 108:18,20 required (6) retentive (2) reflect (3) renegotiating (1) 64:12;93:12;94:16; 23:13;26:13 12:1;15:21;89:20 97:23;98:2;113:3 96:13 retribution (3) reorganization (5) requirement (1) 103:9;122:10;143:11 regard (4) 20:7,20;22:18,18 61:10;100:25; 75:11 returns (1) regarding (1) 114:25;122:14,14 requirements (1) 37:15 153:17 reorganize (1) 23:4 reupload (1) regardless (1) 45:2 requiring (2) 154:20 21:20 repeat (1) 74:10,11 revamped (1) regime (2) 40:23 reread (1) 139:25 36:20,21 repeatedly (1) 147:7 review (2) 75:10 reservation (2) 113:2;138:17 regular (1)

reviewed (1) 11:1 revolt (1) 58:23 rewarded (1) 145:24 rewards (1) 148:23 rid (1) 64:3 right (120) 8:2;12:10;14:24; 16:2;19:3,20;20:2,11, 17,18;22:8;23:21,22; 24:19;25:6;33:1,9; 34:21;35:12,13;36:3,6, 7,25;37:1;41:18;42:7; 43:7,8;45:1,5,7,21,23; 46:1;48:9,21;52:8; 56:14,15,15,21;58:7; 59:9,10;62:1,7,15,16; 66:2.8:67:4:71:3: 72:21;73:20;75:1; 78:18;80:4;82:14;83:5, 7,25;84:7,24;85:11; 86:3,19;87:12,14;89:1; 91:13;92:7,18;93:24; 94:9;95:14;96:3,3,19, 21;97:10,16;98:10; 99:21;106:3;107:24; 108:5,8:110:7:112:13; 113:5.14.25:115:7: 116:12,13;118:3,5; 119:21;120:6,11,25; 124:6,15,15:126:20; 127:5;130:8;132:16; 135:3,3:139:6,10; 140:4;143:15;147:1,2, 2;150:23;154:4 rights (1) 13:14 rise (2) 87:9;143:19 **risk** (5) 31:7;44:11,23;58:21; 108:18 risks (1) 91:22 river (1) 65:15 road (1) 14:14 Robert (1) 27:4 robust (1) 88:1 Roger (1) 92:10 role (1) 46:7 roll (1) 41:3 rollback (1)

GAS AND ELECTRIC C	OMPANI	T	T	April 9, 2019
113:14	137:11	gogonda (1)	86:5,5	154:21
		seconds (1)	*	
room (7)	SAN (11)	63:16	set (6)	signed (1)
26:10;42:25;71:15;	7:1;45:22,25;50:22;	Section (8)	65:25;125:4;126:1,2;	154:5
91:8;101:8;138:19;	73:3,23;75:18;84:4;	10:9,12;11:20,21;	148:2;149:19	significant (7)
154:15	134:22,25;140:3	94:6;99:8;120:18;	sets (1)	29:10;32:2;69:14;
Rose (6)	satisfaction (2)	144:8	12:1	71:9;86:12;89:13;
11:9,9;12:3,5,9,11	102:25;150:4	security (1)	setting (1)	100:4
Rosenfeld (1)	satisfied (4)	122:3	144:20	significantly (2)
92:10	88:2;122:25;144:12;	SED (2)	settled (1)	30:3;64:22
round (1)	148:16	75:12;78:20	54:2	similar (1)
139:14	satisfy (3)	seeing (2)	settlement (4)	88:11
routinely (1)	21:22;122:23;132:9	45:13;110:17	48:13;56:5;79:18;	similarly (1)
51:24			140:5	145:16
	saw (3)	seek (2)		
rubber (1)	12:25;34:3;65:8	23:3;118:4	seventy-five (1)	Simon (17)
52:18	saying (31)	seem (4)	49:6	28:15,23;32:7,22;
rule (4)	13:15;21:21;25:11;	27:11;71:20;137:16,	several (8)	33:14;38:25;45:10;
63:10;109:8;130:25;	31:12;32:2,5;37:21;	18	13:17;30:14;47:2;	58:17;64:13;66:8;67:1,
151:24	38:17;45:11;48:5;	seemed (3)	59:19;68:14;80:12;	4;86:11;103:24;
ruled (2)	50:19,19;55:22;56:18;	13:20;149:9;153:23	145:11,12	115:23;117:6;136:10
39:22;85:12	61:16;63:16;70:22;	seems (3)	shall (2)	Simon's (3)
rules (4)	78:10;83:11;113:16;	41:4;100:9;126:23	7:22;46:22	28:19;106:12;131:16
9:12;50:12,16;	116:5;130:16;133:5;	self-scoring (1)	share (4)	simple (4)
151:11	136:8,16;139:24;	61:18	37:22;55:1;63:4;	8:11;11:11;37:21;
ruling (6)	142:17;149:13;150:21;	semi-annual (1)	138:24	38:17
39:18;143:16,17,17;	151:3;152:18	139:7	sharp (1)	
				simply (3)
149:12,13	schedule (1)	Send (9)	66:20	94:23;142:18;147:8
run (1)	7:21	51:6;60:21;62:3;	sheet (1)	single (5)
151:14	school (1)	64:8;65:16;66:7;67:10;	53:25	41:22;42:16;110:25;
running (1)	66:16	96:12;135:12	shift (1)	122:23;130:15
93:8	scope (1)	sending (1)	71:2	Singleton (1)
run-of- (1)	74:14	63:8	Ship (3)	69:9
144:17	score (10)	senior (2)	73:7;86:8,14	sit (6)
run-of-the (1)	29:7;38:25;39:2;	90:15;114:15	shooting (2)	59:11;62:8;70:18,19;
144:17	45:12,14;60:18,23;	sense (10)	44:4;75:16	71:3;152:16
runs (2)	133:4;138:1;139:17	26:11;35:25;54:25;	short (2)	sitting (4)
109:5;136:15	scored (6)	55:1;90:6;104:18;	50:22;69:4	26:10,14;79:15;
107.3,130.13	31:15;39:10,12;52:2;	105:1;113:20;145:7,23	shorten (1)	123:12
S	67:12;151:14	sensitivities (1)	8:12	situation (1)
S				
0 (4)	scores (1)	71:2	short-term (5)	128:3
safer (1)	31:8	sensitivity (1)	36:11;37:8,9,16;	six (5)
93:9	scoring (16)	69:12	71:22	35:10,11;58:8,9;
safety (43)	31:18;54:3,15;55:16,	sensitized (1)	show (4)	139:8
39:11;45:8,15;52:3;	24;56:4;60:25;132:5;	136:9	34:24;47:5;55:16;	sixty (1)
54:19;56:7,20;60:11,	133:7;135:18;136:15;	sent (2)	135:18	107:21
19,25;61:4,5,23;64:11;	137:25;138:3;140:8,	52:6;130:20	showing (4)	sixty-five (4)
75:3,5,7,8,23;84:11,14,	23;147:21	sentence (1)	70:4,5,25;90:17	101:18;112:15;
21,24;85:13;88:3,11;	screwed (1)	30:17	shown (1)	123:5;140:4
89:4,19,25;90:8;91:2,	47:7	sentencing (1)	137:4	skeptical (1)
18;101:18;102:23;	seal (1)	49:1	shows (3)	10:22
103:12;112:12;114:17;	148:15	separate (2)	47:9;54:2;139:17	Slane (1)
122:13;123:5;133:7;	season (2)	12:20;99:15	sic (3)	37:12
	46:22;114:9		60:8;97:9;99:14	
135:20;136:19;140:4		sequence (1)		SLF (1)
salary (3)	seated (2)	87:4	side (8)	69:2
81:13;82:2;111:11	87:10;143:20	sequencing (1)	27:17;44:19;91:8;	slight (2)
same (33)	second (12)	18:2	104:17;128:13;133:16;	11:24;23:20
17:11;19:15;23:6;	8:21;11:4;14:5;29:5;	serious (6)	136:19;144:15	slow (1)
24:7;26:3;31:11;33:13;	31:6;34:8,15;40:3;	52:6,7;63:9,10,12;	sides (3)	34:7
49:13,13;53:6;60:6,7;	61:8;64:14;69:24;	79:10	139:3;144:1,2	small (1)
63:25;66:17,18,25;	143:21	seriously (2)	side's (1)	71:13
68:2;70:6,18,25;88:16;	second-guess (1)	53:11;71:5	129:24	smaller (1)
98:9;100:11;102:1,8;	109:23	service (1)	sidetrack (1)	98:20
106:7,22;113:8;	secondly (2)	90:2	16:21	Smith (2)
120:17,18;121:4,24;	9:7;63:5	session (2)	sign (1)	82:1,8
120.17,10,121.4,24,	7.1,03.3	Session (2)	Sign (1)	02.1,0
		-		-

GAS AND ELECTRIC
snow (1)
59:7 snowed (1)
58:15 SoCal (1)
134:24
so-called (1) 12:15
Solomon-like (1) 139:6
solution (4)
138:24;145:19; 150:5,5
solve (1) 137:11
solvent (2)
70:15;71:10 somebody (6)
12:19;85:19;134:10; 148:8;149:10;150:7
somehow (1)
18:5 someone (8)
12:12;35:6;74:6; 89:2;113:11;128:15;
136:18;137:8
sometime (1) 100:7
sometimes (2) 7:13;152:9
somewhat (1) 130:2
somewhere (2)
18:5;154:15 Sonoma (4)
43:17;52:13;53:19; 60:20
soon (3) 90:9;100:7;122:16
sorry (9)
65:15;73:19;74:20; 87:10;92:16;125:1;
127:9;143:24;153:6 sort (6)
81:19;100:16;
105:13;116:17;130:3; 144:13
sorts (1) 81:17
soul (1) 66:24
sound (1)
106:9 sounds (4)
57:6;60:3;126:10; 130:6
South (1)
50:21 spark (1)
52:19 speak (5)
13:4;19:21;73:9;

87:5,6

AND PACIFIC OMPANY
SPEAKER (1) 125:14
speakers (1) 73:13
speaking (1) 27:2
special (2) 55:11;99:7
specific (3) 12:20;60:25;94:11
specifically (3) 60:25;147:19;149:1
specifics (1) 147:11
specified (1) 154:1
speed (1) 7:15
spent (3)
28:11;65:3;139:22 Sperry's (1)
28:8 spirit (1)
29:22 spoke (2)
18:14;145:19 sprays (1)
47:3 spreadsheet (1)
82:1 square (1)
49:3 squirrel (5)
52:16,17,21,24; 137:21
stability (2) 128:2;129:9
Stabilization (1) 88:18
stabilize (1) 115:12
stabilized (1) 88:18
stake (1) 43:16
stakeholders (1) 114:23
stand (9) 44:19;128:16;137:6;
138:7;140:7;147:18; 148:4,20;152:19
standards (2) 23:5,23
standpoint (1) 104:6
staring (1) 47:10
start (10) 19:21;28:10;64:6;
87:18;130:10;136:25; 139:11;141:4,4;147:15
started (3)

starting (4)	22,
27:13;29:5;70:24;	95:
96:1 starts (2)	98: 103
71:1;114:9	108
state (7)	111
8:25;61:6;83:14;	116
107:15;133:15;134:20, 22	123
stated (4)	126 134
18:2;46:20;64:13,14	146
statement (3)	STIP
20:12;66:11;117:20	123
statements (1) 24:10	STIP : 63:
States (6)	stipul
11:15;29:5,21;86:9;	71:
105:3;134:20	stipul
status (4)	88:
97:4;98:2;99:7; 119:25	stock 37:
statute (2)	stood
23:24;121:25	88:
stay (1)	stop (
150:13 stayed (1)	35: 120
58:1	story
staying (1)	68:
26:14	straig
step (2)	44:
44:7;144:5 steroids (1)	stran;
119:3	stran
stiff (1)	76:
59:2	Strau
stiff-armed (1) 131:13	90: stress
still (24)	65:
19:16;24:14;29:16;	stretc
41:7;55:4;60:17;61:21;	112
63:24;64:4,4,5;65:9; 67:24;68:2,4;71:16;	strict
92:8;95:3;117:4;	stripe
120:10;126:11;137:5,	47:
7;145:6	stripi
STIP (122)	47:
12:15;13:18;14:7,7, 11,22;15:19,24;16:9,	strive 23:
12;17:13;28:12,14,20,	struct
21,24,25;29:6,9;30:5,8,	25:
18;31:7;33:1,21;34:24;	struct
35:1,4,6,18,20;36:11, 19;37:19;38:22,23;	29: strug
39:1,11,14;40:4;44:10,	40:
12,15;45:11;47:15,16,	study
20,21,23;51:12;53:15;	45:
57:22,24;58:1,5,10; 59:20;61:14;62:9;	stuff (34:
63:13,17;64:3,8,11;	54: 54:
(7.10.60.12.71.4.72.6.	125

```
25;94:2,12,23;
      10,23;97:7,18;
      14,25;99:14,15,18;
     3:22;106:5,24;
     8:3,16;110:2,2;
     1:21;112:16;114:3;
     6:2,17;117:2;
     3:15,23;125:5;
     6:1;128:4;131:22;
     4:9:136:2:145:13;
     6:3;147:7;149:24
      'd (1)
     3:22
     Ps (1)
      18
     late (1)
                              14:2
     lation (2)
      13;124:5
      (4)
      23;38:2;70:5,22
      (3)
      17;110:23;121:10
                              93:5
      (4)
      2;46:25;61:13;
     0:5
      (1)
      2
     ght (2)
      5:49:10
     ge (1)
      19
     ger (1)
      18
     uss (1)
      14
     sful (1)
      11
     ch (1)
     2:19
      (1)
      4
     er (1)
      18
      ing (1)
      18
     e (1)
      10
     ture (2)
                              69:7
      3,4
     tures (2)
      12;88:11
     gling (1)
      17
     (1)
      18
      (8)
      17,17;39:23;42:2;
      22;118:13;126:8;
                              48:1
  137:5
sub- (1)
  94:18
                              61:2;93:6
subject (6)
                            supplement (3)
```

46:3;67:3;70:21

67:10;69:13;71:4;72:6;

81:14;82:1,2,9;87:20;

88:24;90:6,10;92:18,

22;93:1,11,15,19,19,

				- '
8:2;27:14;123:22	63:14	ten-minute (1)	40:10	39:25;42:1,10,16;
supplemental (2)		143:15	thoroughly (2)	68:2;97:7;107:21;
75:24,25	T	tent (1)	17:22;45:19	108:4;110:19;111:17;
supplied (1)		65:15	though (9)	113:10;120:5;122:25;
111:19	table (2)	tents (1)	11:19;14:5;31:9;	127:16
suppliers (1)	30:18;106:16	65:21	32:7;57:7;62:10;75:9;	toll (1)
89:7	tables (2)	term (5)	136:18;144:15	29:11
support (6)	35:24;38:18	74:19;105:1;118:14;	thought (11)	took (11)
13:5;73:25;86:8;		132:7,8	10:9;19:23;29:25;	32:22;38:12;39:4;
	tag (1) 47:8			
89:17;90:10;92:2		terminal (1) 52:18	40:11;41:16;42:24;	65:7;71:11;75:15,18,
supportable (1)	talk (4)		48:16,16;74:22;	21;83:16;132:2;147:4
105:1	41:22;77:9;133:14;	terminals (1)	103:21;154:3	tool (1)
supportive (1)	152:19	52:17	thousand (1)	88:13
90:25	talked (10)	terminate (2)	81:14	top (4)
supports (1)	42:11;66:10;68:8;	10:1;13:11	thousands (4)	16:10,17;69:23;
84:5	69:21;74:21;100:20;	terms (15)	29:2,14;32:18;67:1	105:18
suppose (3)	133:23;137:3;139:21,	13:10;18:13;69:14;	threat (1)	tort (23)
13:23;22:3;99:12	24	70:20;88:4;89:4;90:2;	136:3	8:7,16;11:6;12:21;
supposed (14)	talking (17)	95:3;121:14,24;	three (12)	18:14;27:2,6;71:8;
26:3;47:5,7,8;51:4;	31:18,23,23,25;39:7,	125:10;130:2;137:8;	19:5;25:2;30:23;	74:1;76:19;84:5;86:9;
79:2;98:17;112:3;	14;41:20,20;46:6;	148:21;149:8	40:3;49:4;55:10;61:6;	91:10;94:22;102:18;
130:2;138:20;139:3;	64:19;68:20;93:1;	terrifically (1)	69:19;73:13;85:10;	103:3,20;105:22;
143:3;147:5,6	107:5;114:15,15;	128:4	138:13;154:19	111:1,23;121:24;
Supreme (3)	120:15;141:15	territory (1)	Three-fourths (1)	122:24;130:22
43:4,11,13	talks (1)	77:18	57:20	torts (1)
sure (21)	32:18	test (1)	three-page (1)	102:13
9:19,23;10:5;11:23;	tall (1)	144:9	123:11	toss (1)
15:16;23:5;28:1,1;	130:10	testified (3)	threshold (4)	147:14
44:8;46:24;55:13;	tangible (1)	121:11;138:8;140:14	125:5;126:10,24;	total (6)
57:12;67:11;82:10;	91:7	testifying (5)	127:3	60:20;61:9;104:10;
85:17;103:25;108:19;	target (14)	54:19;76:3,7;78:7,16	throw (1)	123:23;144:10;149:22
114:16;115:9;121:2;	15:2,3;25:1;35:20;	testimony (4)	24:23	totally (2)
127:12				
	105:19;106:5,7,22,23,	35:1;41:14;78:22;	throws (1)	58:21;111:4
surface (1)	24;107:5;125:17;	150:24	126:14	touch (1)
9:10	126:9,13	testing (1)	Tim (1)	42:17
surprise (1)	targets (5)	148:8	20:4	touched (3)
129:24	24:21;34:21;108:12;	Thanks (2)	timeframe (1)	41:16;74:2;145:5
surprising (1)	112:5;125:6	68:25;99:22	55:1	touches (1)
42:10	tasked (2)	that'll (1)	timeliness (2)	52:19
survives (1)	87:22;89:22	143:14	47:17,17	touchstone (1)
44:11	team (1)	theirs (1)	times (6)	42:13
suspect (1)	65:3	88:12	44:18;57:21,24;	tough (1)
61:14	technically (1)	the-mill (1)	100:19;107:25;148:7	23:15
sustained (3)	20:22	144:18	timing (1)	toured (1)
48:18,20,25	technology (1)	there'd (1)	62:14	65:5
sustaining (1)	152:3	68:1	toast (1)	towards (4)
49:2	teed (2)	therefore (4)	42:23	71:2;84:11,21;90:22
sweeping (1)	82:9;94:18	23:19;61:14;76:17;	Toby (1)	towering (1)
49:23	teeth (1)	126:22	130:21	75:17
switch (1)	55:25	There've (2)	today (29)	Towers (1)
38:8	telephone (1)	135:3;145:14	11:7,12;13:5;15:15;	114:4
sympathetic (2)	52:25	theses (1)	18:18;27:3;28:17;	track (1)
72:1;122:8	telling (7)	112:5	32:13;44:13,19;47:11,	89:1
sympathize (1)	45:7;60:17;106:10;	thinking (3)	22;48:5,6;55:4;76:24;	tradeoff (1)
70:16				38:3
	130:1;135:25;142:10;	32:3;41:8;85:19 Third (3)	83:1;87:19;90:19;	traditional (2)
sync (1)	152:3	Third (3)	92:11;96:21;107:25;	
61:13	tells (1)	31:7;114:11;151:13	110:19;128:19;130:1;	61:21;101:25
synthesizes (1)	117:21	thirty (6)	137:4;144:4;145:19;	tragedies (3)
66:17	temporal (1)	43:4;50:3,4;52:11;	148:2	31:22,23;32:2
system (6)	49:12	63:16;101:4	together (6)	trailer (2)
31:8;43:22;48:4;	ten (6)	thirty-two (2)	28:24;66:22;107:19;	65:8,15
55:17;60:23;78:24	47:23;55:5;56:6;	131:2;132:11	126:6,23;127:25	trailers (1)
systemic (1)	77:1;143:13,17	thorough (1)	told (14)	65:21

-	T			
trained (1)	122:7;123:12;124:19;	Um-hum (5)	7:9,14;12:6;17:5;	valves (1)
139:2	125:3;126:11;141:1	94:3;96:7;98:22;	22:17;27:14;33:11,20;	75:22
transcript (3)	TUESDAY (1)	102:24;154:16	34:2;39:5;40:16;44:19;	various (1)
41:22;48:18;134:4	7:1	un (1)	47:7,20;49:5;52:12,16,	94:12
transformer (3)	turn (11)	86:25	24;53:2;56:10;57:18;	vast (4)
52:15;53:1,7	18:22;40:22;42:19;	uncertain (1)	61:6;65:7,25;73:10;	62:23;145:24;146:1,
transformers (2)	51:18;62:8;75:16,18,	128:3	75:17;82:9;87:5;93:16;	2
52:10;53:19	22;146:14;147:19;	uncertainty (4)	94:18;98:24;101:25;	vats (1)
translate (3)	149:2	29:19;50:17;115:7;	110:23;120:13;121:10;	65:9
56:25;147:9;148:11	turned (1)	134:8	123:7,7,8,24;130:11;	vegetation (3)
transparency (1)	106:16	under (52)	131:12;137:4,17;	24:11;25:8;148:7
84:16	tutorial (4)	9:17;10:9,12,23;	150:13;151:19;152:24	vendors (1)
treat (1)	148:24;150:22;	11:20,21;12:24;13:10;	update (1)	89:7
102:16	152:2,3	20:6,22,22;23:3;24:13,	77:12	version (2)
treated (4)	tweaked (1)	15;25:18;26:21;29:16;	upload (1)	14:7;97:22
8:7;13:23;14:3;	101:7	36:20,21;38:24;39:2;	154:17	versions (1)
146:25	tweaking (3)	45:14;59:8,15;66:10;	uploaded (2)	146:11
treating (1)	64:8,11;96:13	75:22;79:11;81:14;	10:6;153:12	versus (1)
17:18	tweaks (2)	82:1;101:25;103:10;	upon (8)	41:19
TREDINNICK (17)	56:13;89:1	106:14,20;108:3;	33:13;47:9;48:2;	vice (1)
72:22,25,25;73:2,8;	twelve (2)	109:6,7,13;112:18;	96:22;124:22;140:22;	22:11
83:25;84:2,3,8,10;85:1,	16:10,17	116:12;119:16;120:17,	141:16;146:12	victim (3)
4,6,8,11,22;86:1	twenty (4)	18;121:4,25;123:18,	upped (1)	66:12;86:13;135:23
tree (1)	52:10;58:8,9;139:22	19;130:20,20;144:9;	140:4	victims (25)
89:8	twenty- (1)	146:4;148:15;151:25	upward (5)	29:15;44:25;65:4,14,
trees (4)	123:22	underground (4)	84:24;89:20,25;	19,20;66:10,11;67:2,
45:8;48:3;52:12;	twenty-five (4)	78:21,24;79:4;148:8	123:20;124:24	21,21;69:3,9;73:21;
91:17	56:7;125:12,13,15	underpaid (2)	upwards (2)	91:10;92:1;94:22;
trial (3)	twenty-four (1)	31:3;42:10	39:11;40:5	101:1;102:14;116:25;
18:22;46:8;83:1	95:8	underreporting (1)	urge (1)	129:25;136:9;145:18,
tried (2)	twenty-six (1)	75:10	129:18	22;146:20
119:17;144:24	43:17	understandable (1)	USA (1)	victims' (1)
trimmers (1)	twice (2)	147:12	47:3	145:16
89:8	19:15;40:13	Understood (3)	use (9)	view (19)
trouble (1)	two (33)	72:10;77:24;78:1	26:4;49:22;83:15;	33:12;37:11,13;
137:12	8:14;17:9;19:13;	undisputed (1)	89:1;121:4;149:8;	38:24;39:17;43:10;
truck (1)	20:8;27:16;28:2;33:19,	121:12	152:1,8,9	58:15;60:5,12,16;61:9;
65:6	25;37:21,23;40:2,24;	UNIDENTIFIED (1)	used (5)	64:20;66:9;71:22;
true (8)	48:1;52:16;55:18;	125.14		
17:6;25:4;49:16,16;		125:14	25:12;26:4;57:3;	100:11;131:7;133:15;
	57:21,24;60:22,24;	union (10)	88:13,19	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3
58:22;115:9;117:19;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17,	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15;	88:13,19 useful (1)	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1)
118:20	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11;	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17
118:20 truly (1)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9,	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1)	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5)	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13,	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3)	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13)	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21,	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2) 10:18;114:6	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12; 99:15;110:20,22;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8; 141:10	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V value (14)	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7 volume (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12; 99:15;110:20,22; 112:7;123:16;125:11;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2) 10:18;114:6	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8; 141:10 unstabilizing (2)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V value (14) 88:19,19;90:21;91:3,	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7 volume (1) 54:22
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12; 99:15;110:20,22; 112:7;123:16;125:11; 127:18;143:16,17	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2) 10:18;114:6 U UCC (4)	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8; 141:10 unstabilizing (2) 128:4,14	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V value (14) 88:19,19;90:21;91:3, 6,24;102:21,22;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7 volume (1) 54:22 voluminous (1)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12; 99:15;110:20,22; 112:7;123:16;125:11; 127:18;143:16,17 trying (15)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2) 10:18;114:6 U UCC (4) 94:16;95:12,21;	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8; 141:10 unstabilizing (2) 128:4,14 unusual (6)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V value (14) 88:19,19;90:21;91:3, 6,24;102:21,22; 103:12;114:21;115:16;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7 volume (1) 54:22 voluminous (1) 7:12
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12; 99:15;110:20,22; 112:7;123:16;125:11; 127:18;143:16,17 trying (15) 15:8;32:3;71:24;	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2) 10:18;114:6 U UCC (4) 94:16;95:12,21; 140:5	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8; 141:10 unstabilizing (2) 128:4,14 unusual (6) 71:6;101:3,9,14,22;	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V value (14) 88:19,19;90:21;91:3, 6,24;102:21,22; 103:12;114:21;115:16; 122:6;123:23;129:10	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7 volume (1) 54:22 voluminous (1) 7:12 VP (2)
118:20 truly (1) 23:12 Trustee (15) 11:15,25;12:21; 19:21;20:4;22:21,23; 26:17;73:25;84:15; 86:9;100:1,15;105:3; 133:5 Trustee's (1) 20:5 truth (3) 47:21;48:15;52:9 try (12) 25:17;27:7;73:12; 99:15;110:20,22; 112:7;123:16;125:11; 127:18;143:16,17 trying (15)	57:21,24;60:22,24; 62:9;63:1;65:2;69:17, 23;72:17;95:25;98:11; 106:12;107:19;114:9, 10;121:19;138:12 two-hour (1) 149:19 type (2) 102:1;121:24 types (2) 89:15;101:25 typical (7) 60:13,15;67:9;68:21, 22;71:13;130:2 typically (2) 10:18;114:6 U UCC (4) 94:16;95:12,21;	union (10) 27:15;93:2;94:12,15; 95:15,22,22;96:25; 99:6;135:13 union's (1) 95:23 United (3) 11:14;86:9;105:3 unless (9) 10:2;12:12,18;18:6; 26:9,22;94:10;95:18; 150:7 unsecured (16) 54:1,9;56:5;87:1,17; 90:15,24;95:9;111:15; 113:8;121:21,23; 124:2;129:8;136:8; 141:10 unstabilizing (2) 128:4,14 unusual (6)	88:13,19 useful (1) 53:9 using (1) 83:14 usual (5) 17:18;63:9,13;86:13, 14 utilities (3) 17:16;47:5;78:21 utility (13) 17:6,7,12;66:16; 81:10;90:17;93:4,8; 134:19,21;146:6,8,10 V value (14) 88:19,19;90:21;91:3, 6,24;102:21,22; 103:12;114:21;115:16;	100:11;131:7;133:15; 146:6;147:3 views (1) 66:17 vindictive (1) 145:17 violated (1) 13:11 violates (1) 113:17 violation (3) 49:1,2;53:8 violations (3) 75:11;81:21,21 vis-a-vis (1) 97:8 vividly (1) 68:7 volume (1) 54:22 voluminous (1) 7:12

				1 /
	134:18;135:16	withdraw (4)	146:7	
\mathbf{W}	whatever's (1)	9:18;28:20,23;43:15	worried (2)	Z
vv	146:6	withdrawal (3)	64:16;134:2	L
waga (1)	what's (24)	153:22,25;154:2	write (1)	zero (2)
wage (1) 59:5	14:14;26:5;40:13,17;	withdrawn (8)	45:11	17:23;124:23
	43:16;45:5,7;57:3;	28:12;34:19;35:1,5,	written (1)	*
wages (4)	68:10,17,18;74:18;	12,14;118:8,14	117:3	zone (1)
94:6;98:2,24;99:2	97:17,23;100:14;	withdrew (1)	wrong (9)	44:7
wait (5)	101:9,10;103:4;	103:22	62:25;64:3;83:16;	1
11:4;69:17,24;	105:24;107:23;114:2,	within (10)	93:5;96:17;100:14;	1
100:18;136:4	7;122:11;150:4	15:18;23:20;26:5;	144:18;146:6;149:6	1 (1)
waited (1)	Where's (2)	47:6;77:12;78:19;	wrong-doers (1)	1 (1)
62:11	61:13;126:14	84:19;109:17;126:18;	62:20	138:3
waiting (4)	Whereupon (1)	130:24	wrongdoing (1)	1,000 (1)
53:9;69:18,23;	155:2	without (12)	63:21	52:13
143:22				1,400 (3)
walking (1)	white (1) 47:4	21:25;60:17;80:22;	wrote (1)	92:21;94:24;98:20
134:2		81:7;85:16;88:5;91:15;	115:24	1,600 (2)
wants (8)	whole (11)	117:17;130:25;131:10;	wrought (1)	13:20;73:21
10:15;12:13;69:4;	29:22;30:2;32:8;	137:4,8	134:21	1.5 (15)
72:16;87:1;134:3;	41:17,17;64:21;65:3;	witness (14)	WTW (1)	29:8;31:8,14,15;
151:14,15	98:14;132:1;141:4,25	140:16,25,25;	140:22	32:8;38:25;39:2,4,12;
watch (1)	whomever (1)	141:14;147:18;148:4,		45:12,14;52:4,4;60:18;
100:19	147:17	23;149:21;150:19,20;	X	138:3
watched (1)	Who's (5)	152:13,15,16,19		1.52 (1)
43:17	11:7;27:2;44:19;	witnesses (1)	X's (1)	39:12
water (3)	72:24;73:4	149:2	25:12	1.9 (4)
65:10,10;143:25	whose (4)	woman (1)		39:10;45:14;52:3;
Watson (1)	65:6;66:16;145:18;	73:4	\mathbf{Y}	60:19
114:5	146:22	wonder (1)		1:12 (1)
way (37)	wide-scale (1)	134:13	yard (1)	143:18
7:12;10:16,17;12:13,	29:19	wonk (1)	65:12	1:28 (1)
16;18:7,8;32:12;38:17;	widespread (2)	43:9	year (46)	155:2
40:8;44:22;47:25;	47:2,12	word (13)	16:3,23;25:15;29:23,	1:30 (1)
54:24;58:24;65:7,11;	wild (1)	32:24;33:1,2,5;	24;30:10;31:16;34:20;	149:18
68:3;73:13;82:9,10;	148:7	46:14;49:22;57:3;80:5;	35:17;38:3;39:3,7,9,	10,000 (17)
83:19;94:14;103:24;	wildest (1)	96:17;124:22;127:14;	12;40:4,11,12;43:19;	15:18;16:4;21:10;
107:23;108:19;109:2;	108:14	144:18;149:7	44:14;45:22,23;46:2,	22:1,7;49:24;56:1;
	wildfire (27)	words (15)	11,18;49:5,8;50:8,8,11;	
114:5;116:18;118:15,	39:10;45:15;46:22;	32:25;35:23;49:22;	52:4,15;57:18,22;	57:1;62:19;71:22;
16,21;136:1,20;140:3;	54:19;56:2,7,9,20;	59:11;64:2;89:2;93:19;	60:18,20;62:12;69:17,	101:17;110:1;115:5;
141:2,2;150:24	60:19,25;64:11;101:1,	107:15,25;108:23;	23;72:4;75:3,13;80:21;	122:18;137:12;146:2;
ways (1)	20;112:17,23;113:2;	116:10;123:11,13;	115:25;121:19;124:17;	150:1
114:12	114:9,22;115:20;	126:23;147:21	128:21	10,800 (1)
wearing (1)	117:14;119:8;122:8;	work (13)	year-end (1)	15:23
17:12	133:3,6;135:20,22,23		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	100 (1)
weed (1)		30:9;61:17;62:3;	124:23	125:21
91:20	wildfires (4)	87:6;93:3,8;108:12;	years (24)	100-something (1)
week (3)	29:23;86:14;91:3;	123:7;142:1;144:2;	30:15;35:10,11,22;	40:11
16:22;18:13;71:19	92:1	147:21;148:10;149:24	36:18;43:5;47:2,23;	101 (1)
weeks (6)	Williams (1)	worked (2)	49:5;50:3,4;52:11;	42:15
62:9;65:2;116:2,3,7;	83:15	50:4;124:10	55:5,11;59:19,24;	101A (1)
130:25	Williams' (1)	worker (2)	69:19;77:2;101:5;	53:8
weight (1)	82:16	25:11;37:22	105:17;112:11;121:19,	1040 (1)
69:14	willing (3)	workers (1)	19;129:1	56:20
weighting (2)	97:9;111:10;149:18	72:2	year's (2)	105 (3)
		workforce (4)	35:17;40:7	125:21;126:13,15
14/:10:149:24	Willis (1)			
147:10;149:24 Weil (2)	Willis (1) 114:4	115:8,12;128:2;	yellow (1)	107 (1)
Weil (2)			yellow (1) 47:4	107 (1) 23·3
Weil (2) 8:20;153:15	114:4	115:8,12;128:2;	47:4	23:3
Weil (2) 8:20;153:15 Weinberg (1)	114:4 wind (1)	115:8,12;128:2; 129:9		23:3 11 (9)
Weil (2) 8:20;153:15 Weinberg (1) 92:10	114:4 wind (1) 150:2 wish (6)	115:8,12;128:2; 129:9 working (3) 71:1;93:7;116:5	47:4 yesterday (2) 53:2;54:9	23:3 11 (9) 9:22;29:4,20;42:23;
Weil (2) 8:20;153:15 Weinberg (1) 92:10 weren't (5)	114:4 wind (1) 150:2 wish (6) 19:22;44:13;67:14;	115:8,12;128:2; 129:9 working (3) 71:1;93:7;116:5 works (2)	47:4 yesterday (2) 53:2;54:9 York (1)	23:3 11 (9) 9:22;29:4,20;42:23; 90:20;104:25;114:6;
Weil (2) 8:20;153:15 Weinberg (1) 92:10 weren't (5) 12:7;21:15;72:6;	114:4 wind (1) 150:2 wish (6) 19:22;44:13;67:14; 69:3;72:6;108:1	115:8,12;128:2; 129:9 working (3) 71:1;93:7;116:5 works (2) 147:19;148:24	47:4 yesterday (2) 53:2;54:9	23:3 11 (9) 9:22;29:4,20;42:23; 90:20;104:25;114:6; 115:17;130:3
Weil (2) 8:20;153:15 Weinberg (1) 92:10 weren't (5)	114:4 wind (1) 150:2 wish (6) 19:22;44:13;67:14;	115:8,12;128:2; 129:9 working (3) 71:1;93:7;116:5 works (2)	47:4 yesterday (2) 53:2;54:9 York (1)	23:3 11 (9) 9:22;29:4,20;42:23; 90:20;104:25;114:6;

GAS AND ELECTRIC C	OMPANY		
11:30 (1)	2017 (5)	350-million-dollar (2)	
86:23	35:4;39:9;52:2;	38:23;39:14	Λ
11:42 (1)	60:19;103:14	363 (1)	9
87:8	2018 (34)	120:18	0 (6)
110 (2)	13:8,14;14:7;15:3,	363b (1)	9 (6)
125:20,21	23;28:12,20,25;29:8,	121:4	7:1;46:14,17,18;
1103 (1)	10;30:12;33:6;35:5;	3rd (2)	47:25;137:1
11:21	40:1,5,13;47:1;57:24;	74:5;112:22	9,000 (1)
111 (2)	67:5;94:2;95:6;103:15,	71.3,112.22	22:3
41:21;134:4	22;106:4,16,23;115:14,	4	9:31 (1)
1113 (6)	25;116:11,18;117:1;	-	7:1
13:11;94:6;97:12,15;	118:22;128:4;134:9	4,000 (3)	90 (1) 125:22
98:15;99:8	2019 (30)	14:7,10;15:22	95 (3)
12:54 (1)	7:1;14:22;15:19;	400 (3)	125:22;126:12,14
143:18	28:14,19,21;30:4;	14:25;16:18;36:1	123.22,120.12,14
130 (1)	33:21;35:20;39:1;	49 (1)	
57:24	40:14;42:23;46:22;	78:23	
130- (2)	63:10,17;67:7,15,16;		-
40:7,7	90:16;106:5,16;108:3;	5	
14,000 (3)	112:17,22;113:2;		-
14:11;16:13;29:12	116:13,17;119:8;	5,000 (2)	
15 (1)	130:19;147:7	56:1;82:2	
34:24	2020 (2)	50 (1)	
150 (3)	33:22,23	126:3	
105:20;124:23;126:4	22 (2)	503 (2)	
155 (3)	28:19;136:10	120:12;151:25	
35:6,15;61:10	22nd (1)	503b3 (1)	
16 (1)	115:24	120:10	
34:25	23 (1)	503c (2)	
160- (1)	121:21	120:14,16	
35:17	234 (2)	503c1 (3)	
162- (1)	106:23,24	20:6,7;144:8	
35:17	235 (2)	503c3 (3)	
17 (1)	15:2;106:7	20:7;24:14;144:10	
34:25	235- (3)	(
18 (1)	38:13;39:3,4	6	
35:1 10 (1)	23rd (3)		
19 (1)	149:16,18;151:9	6th (1)	
35:1	260- (1) 40:7	131:23	
2	280- (1)	7	
	40:7	,	
2 (3)	40.7	7 (1)	
23:8;31:14;113:17	3	7 (1) 11:10	
20 (15)	3	70,000 (2)	
12:22,22;13:4,20;	3 (1)	81:13;82:2	
28:6;35:1;86:24;89:11;	125:4	70-million-dollar (1)	
92:10,13,15,22;97:9;	3,500 (1)	106:3	
99:10,14	69:7	72 (3)	
200 (1)	30 (1)	37:10;38:8,13	
105:19	48:11	72- (1)	
2004 (1)	300 (2)	38:12	
130:25	40:12;42:1	72-million-dollar (1)	
2009 (1)	327 (3)	40:6	
75:10	10:9,12;11:20		_
2010 (2)	341 (1)	8	
45:21;73:23	70:2	-	_
2013 (3)	350 (9)	8,000 (1)	
33:22;34:24;35:4	38:13;39:5;40:5;	22:3	
2014 (1)	57:22;61:10;104:20;	8th (3)	
34:24	107:16;108:7,15	130:19;131:15;	
2015 (1)	350- (2)	138:16	
69:22	39:3;108:23		